



LYOF N. TOLSTOÏ

XVII

MY CONFESSION

MY RELIGION

THE GOSPEL IN BRIEF



The Complete Works of
Lyof N. Tolstoï

My Confession
My Religion
The Gospel in Brief
What is to be Done?
Life



THOMAS Y. CROWELL & COMPANY
PUBLISHERS : : NEW YORK

MY CONFESSION
MY RELIGION
THE GOSPEL IN BRIEF

COPYRIGHT, 1899,

By THOMAS Y. CROWELL & CO.

INTRODUCTION

COUNT TOLSTOÏ's religious teachings are not allowed by the censorship to be published complete in Russia, but they are issued in a cheap pamphlet form printed in Geneva, Switzerland. This so-called Elpidin edition has been used in preparing the present translation of "My Confession," and "My Religion," — or as it is called in the original, *F Chom Moya Viera*, "In What my Faith?"¹ If it varies in any material respect from the English translation made some years ago through the medium of the French, it is in the line of greater simplicity. Count Tolstoï can hardly be called a stylist; he writes earnestly, convincingly, often eloquently, but never hesitates to repeat, so that the word or set of words will be found recurring again and again even in the same sentence. The French are stylists, and they modify, condense, and amplify till the semblance of form is sometimes lost, and the thought is transferred in a paraphrase. The plain figure is embroidered and covered with filigree.

Nevertheless, the main thing in these essays is the thought. It is that which Count Tolstoï so earnestly wishes to make known. As he says, he was in the same condition as the thief on the cross, and was saved by

¹ The "Short Exposition of the Gospels," published separately in the same form, is only a part of Count Tolstoï's "Gospel in Brief" which is included in the present volume.

his faith. If the thief on the cross could have lived to preach he might have been a prototype of Paul; but Count Tolstōi was not condemned to die without speaking, and he felt it his duty to tell the world what brought him happiness and peace. It was not to be supposed that his arraignment of a Church, which preached one thing and practised its opposite, would be permitted. The Orthodox Church of his own land stopped it easily enough by forbidding his book to be published and sold. Personally he was let alone, because he preached the gospel of non-resistance and disapproved of nihilistic violence. Elsewhere the reverend critics, avoiding the real question at issue, attacked him with more or less violence, or tried to minimize the effect of his prophet's word by calling him names. In fact, he has been treated with the same spirit as has animated the persecutors of the prophets since the beginning of the world.

Count Tolstōi tells in his "Confession" how he was led from nihilism in the real sense of the word to faith in the literal interpretation of Christ's words, and how he was saved from despair and brought to a joyful knowledge of the meaning of life. In "My Religion" he shows how he threw aside the Church interpretation and went to the original Greek, to Christ's own words, and how he was amazed to find how perfectly they answered the needs of his soul, when once they were stripped of fictitious and extraneous notions. Mr. Huntington Smith, the former translator of "My Confession," in his preface said:—

"The interpretation is not new in theory, but never before has it been carried out with so much zeal, so much determination, so much sincerity, and, granting

the premises, with logic so unanswerable, as in this beautiful confession of faith. How movingly does he depict the doubts and fears of the searcher after the better life; how impressive his earnest inquiry for truth; how inspiring his confidence in the natural goodness as opposed to the natural depravity of man; how convincing his argument that the doctrine of Jesus is simple, practicable, and conducive to the highest happiness; how terrifying his enumeration of the sufferings of 'the martyrs to the doctrine of the world'; how pitiless his arraignment of the Church for its complacent indifference to the welfare of humanity here in this present stage of existence; how sublime his prophecy of the golden age when men shall dwell together in the bonds of love, and sin and suffering shall be no more the common lot of mankind! We read, and are thrilled with a divine emotion, but which of us is willing to accept the truth here unfolded as the veritable secret of life?

"Shall we take seriously this eloquent enunciation of faith in humility, in self-denial, in fraternal love, or shall we regard it only as a beautiful and peaceful phase in the career of a man of genius who, after the storm and stress of a life of sin and suffering, has turned back to the ideals of youth and innocence, and sought to make them once more the objects of desire? Fanaticism, do you say? Ah, yes; but did not Jesus and his disciples practise just such fanaticism as this? Does any one deny that all that is best in this modern world (and there is so much of the best, after all), that all that is best has come from the great moral impulse generated by a little group of fanatics in an obscure corner of Asia eighteen centuries ago? That impulse we still

feel, in spite of all the obstructions that have been put in its way to nullify its action ; and if any would seek for strength from the primary source of power, who shall say him nay? And so although we may smile at the artlessness of this Russian evangelist in his determination to find in the Gospels the categorical imperative of self-renunciation, although we may regard with wonder the magnificent audacity of his exegetical speculations, we cannot refuse to admire a faith so sincere, so intense, and, in many respects, so elevating and so noble."

Count Tolstor makes several references to a "Criticism of Dogmatic Theology" and a translation of the Four Gospels accompanied by a Concordance on which he has been laboring for a number of years. As these works are thoroughly technical and repeat much of what has already been given, and however valuable to the special student and the controversial theologian, are not likely to be of interest to the general reader, it has been decided to omit them from this edition.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
MY CONFESSION	I
MY RELIGION	76

THE GOSPEL IN BRIEF:

AUTHOR'S PREFACE	281
I. The Son of God	297
II. Life in the Spirit	302
III. The Source of Life	311
IV. God's Kingdom	318
V. The True Life	328
VI. The False Life	341
VII. I and the Father are One	353
VIII. Life is not Temporal	363
IX. Temptations	372
X. The Warfare with Temptation	383
XI. The Farewell Discourse	391
XII. The Victory of the Spirit over the Flesh	398
A Prologue: The Understanding of Life	408
A Summary: The Understanding of Life is to do Good	411

A RECAPITULATION:

I. The Son of God	417
II. Life in the Spirit	418
III. The Source of Life	420
IV. God's Kingdom	422
V. The True Life	424
VI. The False Life	427
VII. I and the Father are One	431
VIII. Life is not Temporal	435
IX. Temptations	438
X. The Warfare with Temptation	442
XI. The Farewell Discourse	446
XII. The Victory of the Spirit over the Flesh	449

MY CONFESSION

INTRODUCTION TO "MY RELIGION"

CHAPTER I

I WAS christened and educated in the Orthodox Christian Faith; I was taught it in my childhood, and in my boyhood and youth. Nevertheless, when, at eighteen years of age, I left the university in the second year, I had discarded all belief in anything I had been taught.

To judge by what I can now remember, I never had a serious belief; I merely trusted in what my elders made their profession of faith, but even this trust was very precarious.

I remember once in my twelfth year, a boy, now long since dead, Volodinka M——, a pupil in the gymnasium, spent a Sunday with us, and brought us the news of the last discovery in the gymnasium. This discovery was that there was no God, and that all we were taught on the subject was a mere invention (this was in 1838). I remember well how interested my elder brothers were in this news; I was admitted to their deliberations, and we all eagerly accepted the theory as something particularly attractive and possibly quite true.

I remember, also, that when my elder brother, Dmitri, then at the university, with the impulsiveness natural to his character, gave himself up to a passionate faith, began to attend the church services regularly, to fast, and to lead a pure and moral life, we all of us, and some older than ourselves, never ceased to hold him up to ridicule, and for some incomprehensible reason gave him the nickname of Noah. I remember that Musin-Pushkin, then curator of the University of Kazan, having invited us to a ball, tried to persuade my brother, who had

refused the invitation, by the jeering argument that even David danced before the Ark.

I sympathized then with these jokes of my elders, and drew from them this conclusion, — that I was bound to learn my catechism, and go to church, but that it was not necessary to take all this too seriously.

I also remember that I read Voltaire when I was very young, and that his tone of mockery amused without disgusting me.

This estrangement from all belief went on in me, as it does now, and always has done, in those of the same social position and culture. This falling off, as it seems to me, for the most part goes on thus: people live as others live, and their lives are guided, not by the principles of the faith that is taught them, but by their very opposite; belief has no influence on life, nor on the relations among men — it is relegated to some other sphere apart from life and independent of it; if the two ever come into contact at all, belief is only one of the outward phenomena, and not one of the constituent parts of life.

By a man's life, by his acts, it was then, as it is now, impossible to know whether he was a believer or not. If there be a difference between one who openly professes the doctrines of the Orthodox Church, and one who denies them, the difference is to the advantage of the former. Then, as now, the open profession of the Orthodox doctrines was found mostly among dull, stern, immoral men, and those who think much of their own importance. Intellect, honor, frankness, good nature, and morality are oftener met with among those who call themselves disbelievers.

The school-boy is taught his catechism and sent to church; chinovniks, or functionaries, are required to show a certificate of having taken the holy communion. But the man belonging to our class, who is done with school and does not enter the public service, may now live a dozen years — still more was this the case formerly — without being once reminded of the fact that he lives among Christians, and is reckoned as a member of the Orthodox Christian Church.

Thus it happens that now, as formerly, the influence of early religious teaching, accepted merely on trust and upheld by authority, gradually fades away under the knowledge and practical experience of life, which is opposed to all its principles, and that a man often believes for years that his early faith is still intact, while all the time not a trace of it remains in him.

A certain S——, a clever and veracious man, once related to me how he came to give up his belief.

Twenty-six years ago, while he was off on a hunting expedition, he knelt down to pray before he lay down to rest, according to a habit of his from childhood. His elder brother, who was of the party, lay on some straw and watched him. When S—— had finished, and was preparing to lie down, his brother said to him :—

“Ah, so you still keep that up?”

Nothing more passed between them, but from that day S—— ceased to pray and to go to church. For thirty years S—— has not said a prayer, has not taken the communion, has not been in a church, —not because he shared the convictions of his brother, or even knew them, —not because he had come to any conclusions of his own, —but because his brother's words were like the push of a finger against a wall ready to tumble over with its own weight; they proved to him that what he had taken for belief was an empty form, and that consequently every word he uttered, every sign of the cross he made, every time he bowed his head during his prayers, his act was unmeaning. When he once admitted to himself that such acts had no meaning in them, he could not continue them.

Thus it has been, and is, I believe, with the large majority of men. I am speaking of men of our class, I am speaking of men who are true to themselves, and not of those who make of religion a means of obtaining some temporal advantage. (These men are truly absolute unbelievers; for if faith be to them a means of obtaining any worldly end, it is most certainly no faith at all.) Such men of our own class are in this position: the light of knowledge and life has melted the artifi-

cially constructed edifice of belief within, and they have either observed that and cleared away the superincumbent ruins, or they have remained unconscious of it.

The belief instilled from childhood in me, as in so many others, gradually disappeared, but with this difference; that as from fifteen years of age I had begun to read philosophical works, I became very early conscious of my own disbelief. From the age of sixteen I ceased to pray, and ceased, from conviction, to attend the services of the church and to fast. I no longer accepted the faith of my childhood, but I believed in something, though I could not exactly explain in what. I believed in a God,—or rather, I did not deny the existence of a God,—but what kind of God I could not have told; I denied neither Christ nor His teaching, but in what that teaching consisted I could not have said.

Now, when I think over that time, I see clearly that all the faith I had, the only belief which, apart from mere animal instinct, swayed my life, was a belief in the possibility of perfection, though what it was in itself, or what would be its results, I could not have said.

I tried to reach intellectual perfection; my studies were extended in every direction of which my life afforded me a chance; I strove to strengthen my will, forming for myself rules which I forced myself to follow; I did my best to develop my physical powers by every exercise calculated to give strength and agility, and by way of accustoming myself to patient endurance; I subjected myself to many voluntary hardships and trials of privation. All this I looked on as necessary to obtain the perfection at which I aimed.

At first, of course, moral perfection seemed to me the main end, but I soon found myself contemplating in its stead an ideal of general perfectibility; in other words, I wished to be better, not in my own eyes nor in God's, but in the sight of other men. And very soon this striving to be better in the sight of men feeling again changed into another,—the desire to have more power than others, to secure for myself a greater share of fame, of social distinction, and of wealth.

CHAPTER II

AT some future time I may relate the story of my life, and dwell in detail on the pathetic and instructive incidents of my youth. I think that many and many have had the same experiences as I did. I desired with all my soul to be good; but I was young, I had passions, and I was alone, wholly alone, in my search after goodness. Every time I tried to express the longings of my heart to be morally good, I was met with contempt and ridicule, but as soon as I gave way to low passions, I was praised and encouraged.

Ambition, love of power, love of gain, lechery, pride, anger, vengeance, were held in high esteem.

As I gave way to these passions, I became like my elders, and I felt that they were satisfied with me. A kind-hearted aunt of mine, a really good woman with whom I lived, used to say to me that there was one thing above all others which she wished for me — an intrigue with a married woman: "*Rien ne forme un jeune homme, comme une liaison avec une femme comme il faut.*" Another of her wishes for my happiness was that I should become an adjutant, and, if possible, to the Emperor; the greatest piece of good fortune of all she thought would be that I should find a very wealthy bride, who would bring me as her dowry as many slaves as could be.

I cannot now recall those years without a painful feeling of horror and loathing.

I put men to death in war, I fought duels to slay others, I lost at cards, wasted my substance wrung from the sweat of peasants, punished the latter cruelly, rioted with loose women, and deceived men. Lying, robbery, adultery of all kinds, drunkenness, violence, murder. There was not one crime which I did not commit, and yet I was not the less considered by my equals a comparatively moral man.

Such was my life during ten years.

During that time I began to write, out of vanity, love of gain, and pride. I followed as a writer the same path

which I had chosen as a man. In order to obtain the fame and the money for which I wrote, I was obliged to hide what was good and to say what was evil. Thus I did. How often while writing have I cudgeled my brains to conceal under the mask of indifference or pleasantry those yearnings for something better which formed the real thought of my life. I succeeded in this also, and was praised.

At twenty-six years of age, on the close of the war, I came to Petersburg and made the acquaintance of the authors of the day. I met with a hearty reception and much flattery.

Before I had time to look around, the prejudices and views of life common to the writers of the class with which I associated became my own, and completely put an end to all my former struggles after a better life. These views, under the influence of the dissipation of my life, supplied a theory which justified it.

The view of life taken by these my fellow-writers was that life is a development, and the principal part in that development is played by ourselves, the thinkers, while among the thinkers the chief influence is again due to us, the artists, the poets. Our vocation is to teach men.

In order to avoid answering the very natural question, "What do I know, and what can I teach?" the theory in question is made to contain the formula that it is not necessary to know this, but that the artist and the poet teach unconsciously.

I was myself considered a marvelous artist and poet, and I therefore very naturally adopted this theory. I, an artist and poet, wrote and taught I knew not what. For doing this I received money; I kept a splendid table, had excellent lodgings, women, society; I had fame. Naturally what I taught was very good.

The faith in poetry and the development of life was a true faith, and I was one of its priests. To be one of its priests was very advantageous and agreeable. I long remained in this belief, and never once doubted its truth.

But in the second, and especially in the third year of

this way of life, I began to doubt the infallibility of the doctrine, and to examine it more closely. What first led me to doubt was the fact that I began to notice the priests of this belief did not agree among themselves. Some said :—

“We are the best and most useful teachers ; we teach what is needful, and all others teach wrong.”

They disputed, quarreled, abused, deceived, and cheated one another. Moreover, there were many among us who, quite indifferent to the question who was right or who was wrong, advanced only their own private interests by the aid of our activity. All this forced on me doubts as to the truth of our belief.

Again, having begun to doubt the truth of our literary faith, I began to study its priests more closely, and became convinced that almost all the priests of this faith were immoral men, most of them worthless and insignificant, and beneath the moral level of those with whom I associated during my former dissipated and military career ; but conceited and self-satisfied as only those can be who are wholly saints, or those who know not what holiness is.

I grew disgusted with mankind and with myself, and I understood that this belief was a delusion. The strangest thing in all this was that, though I soon saw the falseness of this belief and renounced it, I did not renounce the rank given me by these men, — the rank of artist, poet, teacher. I was simple enough to imagine that I was a poet and artist, and could teach all men without knowing what I was teaching. But so I did.

By my companionship with these men I had gained a new vice, — a pride developed to a morbid extreme, and an insane self-confidence in teaching men what I myself did not know.

When I now think over that time, and remember my own state of mind and that of these men (a state of mind common enough among thousands still), it seems to me pitiful, terrible, and ridiculous ; it excites the feelings which overcome us as we pass through a madhouse.

We were all then convinced that it behooved us to

speak, to write, and to print as fast as we could, as much as we could, and that on this depended the welfare of the human race. And thousands of us wrote, printed, and taught, and all the while confuted and abused one another. Quite unconscious that we ourselves knew nothing, that to the simplest of all problems in life — what is right and what is wrong — we had no answer, we all went on talking together without one to listen, at times abetting and praising one another on condition that we were abetted and praised in turn, and again turning upon one another in wrath — in short, we reproduced the scenes in a madhouse.

Thousands of laborers worked day and night, to the limit of their strength, setting up the type and printing millions of words to be spread by the post all over Russia, and still we continued to teach, unable to teach enough, angrily complaining the while that we were not much listened to.

A strange state of things indeed, but now it is comprehensible to me. The real motive that inspired all our reasoning was the desire for money and praise, to obtain which we knew of no other means than writing books and newspapers, and so we did. But in order to hold fast to the conviction that while thus uselessly employed we were very important men, it was necessary to justify our occupation to ourselves by another theory, and the following was the one we adopted : —

Whatever is, is right; everything that is, is due to development; development comes from civilization; the measure of civilization is the diffusion of books and newspapers; we are paid and honored for the books and newspapers which we write, and we are therefore the most useful and best of men!

This reasoning might have been conclusive had we all been agreed; but, as for every opinion expressed by one of us there instantly appeared from another one diametrically opposite, we had to hesitate before accepting it. But we did not notice this; we received money, and were praised by those of our party, consequently we — each one of us — considered that we were in the right.

It is now clear to me that between ourselves and the inhabitants of a madhouse there was no difference: at the time I only vaguely suspected this, and, like all madmen, thought all were mad except myself.

CHAPTER III

I LIVED in this senseless manner another six years, up to the time of my marriage. During this time I went abroad. My life in Europe, and my acquaintance with many eminent and learned foreigners, confirmed my belief in the doctrine of general perfectibility, as I found the same theory prevailed among them. This belief took the form which is common among most of the cultivated men of our day. This belief was expressed in the word "progress." It then appeared to me this word had a real meaning. I did not as yet understand that, tormented like every other man by the question, "How was I to live better?" when I answered that I must live for progress, I was only repeating the answer of a man carried away in a boat by the waves and the wind, who to the one important question for him, "Where are we to steer?" should answer, "We are being carried somewhere."

I did not see this then; only at rare intervals my feelings, and not my reason, were roused against the common superstition of our age, which leads men to ignore their own ignorance of life.

Thus, during my stay in Paris, the sight of a public execution revealed to me the weakness of my superstitious belief in progress. When I saw the head divided from the body, and heard the sound with which they fell separately into the box, I understood, not with my reason, but with my whole being, that no theory of the wisdom of all established things, nor of progress, could justify such an act; and that if all the men in the world from the day of creation, by whatever theory, had found this thing necessary, I knew it was not necessary, it was a bad thing, and that therefore I must judge of what was

right and necessary, not by what men said and did, not by progress, but what I felt to be true in my heart.

Another instance of the insufficiency of this superstition of progress as a rule for life was the death of my brother. He fell ill while still young, suffered much during a whole year, and died in great pain. He was a man of good abilities, of a kind heart, and of a serious temper, but he died without understanding why he had lived, and still less what his death meant for him. No theories could give an answer to these questions, either to him or to me, during the whole period of his long and painful lingering.

But these occasions for doubt were few and far between; on the whole, I continued to live in the profession of the faith of progress. "Everything develops, and I myself am developing; and why this is so will one day be apparent," was the formula I was obliged to adopt.

On my return from abroad I settled in the country, and occupied myself with the organization of schools for the peasantry. This occupation was especially dear to my heart, because it was free from the spirit of falsehood so evident to me in the career of a literary teacher.

Here again I acted in the name of progress, but this time I brought a spirit of critical inquiry to the system on which the progress rested. I said to myself that progress was often attempted in an irrational manner, and that it was necessary to leave a primitive people and the children of peasants perfectly free to choose the way of progress which they thought best. In reality I was still bent on the solution of the same impossible problem, — how to teach without knowing what I had to teach. In the highest spheres of literature I had understood that it was impossible to do this because I had seen that each taught differently, and that the teachers quarreled among themselves, and scarcely succeeded in concealing their ignorance from one another. Having now to deal with peasants' children, I thought that I could get over this difficulty by allowing the children to learn what they liked. It seems

now absurd when I remember the expedients by which I carried out this whim of mine to teach, though I knew in my heart that I could teach nothing useful, because I myself did not know what was necessary.¹

After a year spent in this employment with the school I again went abroad, for the purpose of finding out how I was to teach without knowing anything.

I believed that I had found a solution abroad, and, armed with all that essence of wisdom, I returned to Russia, the same year in which the peasants were freed from serfdom; and, accepting the office of arbitrator,² I began to teach the uneducated people in the schools, and the educated classes in the journal which I began to publish. Things seemed to be going on well, but I felt that my mind was not in a normal state and that a change was near. I might even then, perhaps, have come to that state of despair to which I was brought fifteen years later, if it had not been for a new experience in life which promised me safety — family life.

For a year I was occupied with arbitration, with the schools, and with my newspaper, and got so involved that I was harassed to death; the struggle over the arbitration was so hard for me, my activity in the schools was so dubious to me, my shuffling in the newspaper became so repugnant to me, consisting as it did in forever the same thing, — in the desire to teach all people and to hide the fact that I did not know how or what to teach, — that I fell ill, more with a mental than physical sickness, gave up everything, and started for the steppes to the Bashkirs to breathe a fresher air, to drink kumiss, and live an animal life.

After I returned I married. The new circumstances of a happy family life completely led me away from the search after the meaning of life as a whole. My life was concentrated at this time in my family, my wife and children, and consequently in the care for increasing the means of life. The effort to effect my own individual perfection, already replaced by the striving

¹ See "School Scenes from Yasnaya Polyana," Vol. XV.

² *Posrednik*, sometimes translated Justice of the Peace.

after general progress, was again changed into an effort to secure the particular happiness of my family.

In this way fifteen years passed.

Notwithstanding that during these fifteen years I looked upon the craft of authorship as a very trifling thing, I continued all the time to write. I had experienced the seductions of authorship, the temptations of an enormous pecuniary reward and of great applause for valueless work, and gave myself up to it as a means of improving my material position, and of stifling in my soul all questions regarding my own life and life in general. In my writings I taught what for me was the only truth, — that the object of life should be our highest happiness and that of our family.

Thus I lived; but, five years ago, a strange state of mind began to grow upon me: I had moments of perplexity, of a stoppage, as it were, of life, as if I did not know how I was to live, what I was to do, and I began to wander, and was a victim to low spirits. But this passed, and I continued to live as before. Later, these periods of perplexity began to return more and more frequently, and invariably took the same form. These stoppages of life always presented themselves to me with the same questions: "Why?" and "What after?"

At first it seemed to me that these were aimless, unmeaning questions; it seemed to me that all they asked about was well known, and that if at any time when I wished to find answers to them I could do so without much trouble — that just at that time I could not be bothered with this, but whenever I should stop to think them over I should find an answer. But these questions presented themselves to my mind with ever increasing frequency, demanding an answer with still greater and greater persistence, and like dots grouped themselves into one black spot.

It was with me as it happens in the case of every mortal internal ailment — at first appear the insignificant symptoms of indisposition, disregarded by the patient; then these symptoms are repeated more and more frequently, till they merge in uninterrupted suffering. The

sufferings increase, and the patient, before he has time to look around, is confronted with the fact that what he took for a mere indisposition has become more important to him than anything else on earth, that it is death!

This is exactly what happened to me. I became aware that this was not a chance indisposition, but something very serious, and that if all these questions continued to recur, I should have to find an answer to them. And I tried to answer them. The questions seemed so foolish, so simple, so childish; but no sooner had I taken hold of them and attempted to decide them than I was convinced, first, that they were neither childish nor silly, but were concerned with the deepest problems of life; and, in the second place, that I could not decide them — could not decide them, however I put my mind upon them.

Before occupying myself with my Samara estate, with the education of my son, with the writing of books, I was bound to know why I did these things. As long as I do not know the reason “why” I cannot do anything, I cannot live. While thinking about the management of my household and estate,¹ which in these days occupied much of my time, suddenly this question came into my head:—

“Well and good, I have now six thousand desyatins in the government of Samara, and three hundred horses — what then?”

I was perfectly disconcerted, and knew not what to think. Another time, dwelling on the thought of how I should educate my children, I asked myself, “*Why?*” Again, when considering by what means the well-being of the people might best be promoted, I suddenly exclaimed, “But what concern have I with it?” When I thought of the fame which my works were gaining me, I said to myself:—

“Well, what if I should be more famous than Gogol, Pushkin, Shakespear, Molière — than all the writers of the world — well, and what then?”....

I could find no reply. Such questions will not wait:

¹ All this expressed in the one word *khozyaĭstvo*.

they demand an immediate answer ; without one it is impossible to live ; but answer there was none.

I felt that the ground on which I stood was crumbling, that there was nothing for me to stand on, that what I had been living for was nothing, that I had no reason for living.

CHAPTER IV

My life had come to a stop. I was able to breathe, to eat, to drink, to sleep, and I could not help breathing, eating, drinking, sleeping ; but there was no real life in me because I had not a single desire, the fulfilment of which I could feel to be reasonable. If I wished for anything, I knew beforehand that, were I to satisfy the wish, or were I not to satisfy it, nothing would come of it. Had a fairy appeared and offered me all I desired, I should not have known what to say. If I had, in moments of excitement, I will not say wishes, but the habits of former wishes, at calmer moments I knew that it was a delusion, that I really wished for nothing. I could not even wish to know the truth, because I guessed in what it consisted.

The truth was, that life was meaningless. Every day of life, every step in it, brought me, as it were, nearer the precipice, and I saw clearly that before me there was nothing but ruin. And to stop was impossible ; to go back was impossible ; and it was impossible to shut my eyes so as not to see that there was nothing before me but suffering and actual death, absolute annihilation.

Thus I, a healthy and a happy man, was brought to feel that I could live no longer, — some irresistible force was dragging me onward to escape from life. I do not mean that I wanted to kill myself.

The force that drew me away from life was stronger, fuller, and more universal than any wish ; it was a force like that of my previous attachment to life, only in a contrary direction. With all my force I struggled away from life. The idea of suicide came as naturally to me

as formerly that of bettering my life. This thought was so attractive to me that I was compelled to practise upon myself a species of self-deception in order to avoid carrying it out too hastily. I was unwilling to act hastily, only because I wanted to employ all my powers in clearing away the confusion of my thoughts; if I should not clear them away, I could at any time kill myself. And here was I, a man fortunately situated, hiding away a cord, to avoid being tempted to hang myself by it to the transom between the closets of my room, where I undressed alone every evening; and I ceased to go hunting with a gun because it offered too easy a way of getting rid of life. I knew not what I wanted; I was afraid of life; I struggled to get away from it, and yet there *was* something I hoped for from it.

Such was the condition I had to come to, at a time when all the circumstances of my life were pre-eminently happy ones, and when I had not reached my fiftieth year. I had a good, loving, and beloved wife, good children, and a large estate, which, without much trouble on my part, was growing and increasing; I was more than ever respected by my friends and acquaintances; I was praised by strangers, and could lay claim to having made my name famous without much self-deception. Moreover, I was not mad or in an unhealthy mental state; on the contrary, I enjoyed a mental and physical strength which I have seldom found in men of my class and pursuits; I could keep up with a peasant in mowing, and could continue mental labor for eight or ten hours at a stretch, without any evil consequences. And in this state of things it came to this, — that I could not live, and as I feared death I was obliged to employ ruses against myself so as not to put an end to my life.

The mental state in which I then was seemed to me summed up in the following: My life was a foolish and wicked joke played on me by some one. Notwithstanding the fact that I did not recognize a "Some one," who may have created me, this conclusion that some one

had wickedly and foolishly made a joke of me in bringing me into the world seemed to me the most natural of all conclusions.

I could not help reasoning that *there*, somewhere, is some one who is now diverting himself at my expense, as he watches me, as after from thirty to forty years of a life of study and development, of mental and bodily growth, with all my powers matured and having reached that summit of life from which it is seen in its completeness, I stand like a fool on this height, understanding clearly that there is nothing in life, that there never was anything, and never will be. To him it must seem ridiculous.

But whether there is, or is not, such a being, in either case it did not help me. I could not attribute a reasonable motive to any single act in my whole life. I was only astonished that I could not have realized this at the very beginning. All this had so long been known to me! Illness and death would come (indeed, they had come), if not to-day, then to-morrow, to those whom I loved, to myself, and nothing remains but stench and worms. All my acts, whatever I did, would sooner or later be forgotten, and I myself be nowhere. Why, then, busy one's self with anything? How could men fail to see this, and live? How wonderful this is! It is possible to live only as long as life intoxicates us; as soon as we are sober again we see that it is all a delusion, and a stupid delusion! In this, indeed, there is nothing either ludicrous or amusing; it is only cruel and stupid!

There is an old Eastern fable about a traveler in the steppes who is attacked by a furious wild beast. To save himself the traveler gets into a waterless well; but at the bottom of it he sees a dragon with its jaws wide open to devour him. The unhappy man dares not get out for fear of the wild beast, and dares not descend for fear of the dragon, so he catches hold of the branch of a wild plant growing in a crevice of the well. His arms grow tired, and he feels that he must soon perish, death awaiting him on either side, but he

still holds on; and he sees two mice, one black and one white, gradually making their way round the stem of the wild plant on which he is hanging, nibbling it through. The plant will soon give way and break off, and he will fall into the jaws of the dragon. The traveler sees this, and knows that he must inevitably perish; but, while still hanging, he looks around him, and, finding some drops of honey on the leaves of the wild plant, he stretches out his tongue and licks them.

Thus do I cling to the branch of life, knowing that the dragon of death inevitably awaits me, ready to tear me to pieces, and I cannot understand why such tortures have fallen to my lot. I also strive to suck the honey which once comforted me, but this honey no longer rejoices me, while the white mouse and the black, day and night, gnaw through the branch to which I cling. I see the dragon plainly, and the honey is no longer sweet. I see the dragon, from which there is no escape, and the mice, and I cannot turn my eyes away from them. It is no fable, but a living, undeniable truth, to be understood of all men.

The former delusion of happiness in life which hid from me the horror of the dragon no longer deceives me. However I may reason with myself that I cannot understand the meaning of life, that I must live without thinking, I cannot do this, because I have done so too long already. Now I cannot help seeing the days and nights hurrying by and bringing me nearer to death. I can see but this, because this alone is true — all the rest is a lie. The two drops of honey, which more than anything else drew my eyes away from the cruel truth, my love for my family and for my writings, to which latter I gave the name of art, were no longer sweet to me.

"My family," I said to myself; "but a family — a wife and children — are also human beings, and subject to the same conditions as I myself; they must either be living in a lie, or they must see the terrible truth. Why should they live? Why should I love them, care for them, bring them up, and watch over them? To bring

them to the despair which fills myself, or to make dolts of them? As I love them, I cannot conceal from them the truth—every step they take in knowledge leads them to it, and that truth is death.”

“Art, poetry?”

Under the influence of success, and flattered by praise, I had long been persuading myself that this was a work which must be done notwithstanding the approach of death, which would destroy everything—my writings, and the memory of them; but I soon saw that this was only another delusion, I saw clearly that art is only the ornament and charm of life. Life having lost its charm for me, how could I make others see a charm in it? While I was not living my own life, but one that was external to me was bearing me away on its billows, while I believed that life had a meaning, though I could not say what it was, the reflections of life of every kind in poetry and art gave me delight, it was pleasant to me to look at life in the mirror of art; but when I tried to discover the meaning of life, when I felt the necessity of living myself, the mirror became either unnecessary, superfluous, and ridiculous, or painful. I could no longer take comfort from what I saw in the mirror—that my position was stupid and desperate.

It was a genuine cause of rejoicing when in the depths of my soul I believed that my life had a meaning. Then this play of lights, the comic, the tragic, the pathetic, the beautiful, and the terrible in life, amused me. But when I knew that life was meaningless and terrible, the play in the mirror could no longer entertain me. No sweetness could be sweet to me when I saw the dragon, and the mice nibbling away my support.

Nor was that all. Had I simply come to know that life has no meaning, I might have quietly accepted it, might have known that was my allotted portion. But I could not rest calmly on this. Had I been like a man living in a forest, out of which he knows that there is no issue, I could have lived on; but I was like a man lost in a forest, and who, terrified by the thought that he is

lost, rushes about trying to find a way out, and, though he knows each step leads him still farther astray, cannot help rushing about.

It was this that was terrible! And to get free from this horror, I was ready to kill myself. I felt a horror of what awaited me; I knew that this horror was more horrible than the position itself, but I could not patiently await the end. However persuasive the argument might be that all the same a blood-vessel in the heart would be ruptured or something would burst and all be over, still I could not patiently await the end. The horror of the darkness was too great to bear, and I longed to free myself from it as speedily as possible by a rope or a pistol ball. This was the feeling that, above all, drew me to think of suicide.

CHAPTER V

"BUT is it possible that I have overlooked something, that I have failed to understand something," I asked myself; "may it not be that this state of despair is common among men?"

And in every branch of human knowledge I sought an explanation of the questions that tormented me; I sought that explanation painfully and long, not out of mere curiosity; I did not seek it indolently, but painfully, obstinately, day and night; I sought it as a perishing man seeks safety, and I found nothing.

I sought it in all branches of knowledge, and not only did I fail, but, moreover, I convinced myself that all those who had searched like myself had likewise found nothing; and not only had found nothing, but had come, as I had, to the despairing conviction, that the only absolute knowledge man can possess is this,—that life is without meaning.

I sought in all directions, and thanks to a life spent in study, and also to my connections with the learned world, the most accomplished scholars in all the various branches of knowledge were accessible to me, and they

did not refuse to open to me all the sources of knowledge both in books and through personal intercourse. I knew all that learning could answer to the question, "What is life?"

It was long before I could believe that human learning had no clear answer to this question. For a long time it seemed to me, as I listened to the gravity and seriousness of tone wherewith Science affirmed its positions on matters unconnected with the problem of life, that I must have misunderstood something. For a long time I was timid in the presence of learning, and I fancied that the insufficiency of the answers which I received was not its fault, but was owing to my own gross ignorance; but this thing was not a joke or pastime with me, but the business of my life, and I was at last forced, willy-nilly, to the conclusion that these questions of mine were the only legitimate questions underlying all knowledge, and that it was not I that was in fault in putting them, but science in pretending to have an answer to them.

The question, which in my fiftieth year had brought me to the notion of suicide, was the simplest of all questions, lying in the soul of every man, from the undeveloped child to wisest sage; a question without which, as I had myself experienced, life was impossible. That question was as follows:—

"What will come from what I am doing now, and may do to-morrow? what will come from my whole life?"

Otherwise expressed, the question will be this:—

"Why should I live? why should I wish for anything? why should I do anything?"

Again, in other words, it is:—

"Is there any meaning in my life which will not be destroyed by the inevitable death awaiting me?"

To this question, one and the same though variously expressed, I sought an answer in human knowledge, and I found that with respect to this question all human knowledge may be divided as it were into two opposite hemispheres with their two opposite poles, the one

negative, the other positive; but that at neither pole is to be found any answer to the problems of life.

One system of knowledge seems to deny that there is such a question, but, on the other hand, has a clear and exact answer to all its own independent inquiries; this is the system of experimental science, at the extreme end of which is mathematics. Another system accepts the question, but does not answer it; it is that of abstract philosophy, and at its extremity is metaphysics.

I had been addicted from my early youth to abstract studies, but later, mathematics and the natural sciences attracted me; and till I came to put clearly to myself this question as to the meaning of life, until it grew up in me, as it were, of itself, and demanded an immediate answer, I was content with the artificial and conventional answers given by learning.

In the domain of experience I said to myself:—

“Everything develops and becomes differentiated, tends to complication and perfection, and there are laws which govern this process. You are a part of the whole. If you learn as much as possible of this whole, and if you learn the law of its development, you will then know your own place in the great unity, and know yourself as well.”

I am ashamed to confess it, but there was a time when I was satisfied with this. It was the very time when I was myself developing,—when my muscles were growing stronger, my memory was becoming enriched, my powers of thinking and understanding were on the increase,—and I, being conscious of this growth, very naturally thought that the law of my own growth was the law of the universe and explained the meaning of my own life.

But the time came when I had ceased to grow, and I felt that I was not developing, but drying up; my muscles grew weaker, my teeth began to fall out, and I saw that this law of growth not only explained nothing, but that such a law did not and could not exist; that I had taken for a general law what only affected myself at a certain age.

I looked more closely into the nature of this law and it became clear to me that there could be no laws of eternal development; it became clear to me, that to say everything in infinite space and time is developed, complicated, differentiated, and perfected, is to talk nonsense. Such words have no meaning, for in the infinite there can be no simple or compound, or past or future, or better or worse.

The main thing was that my personal question, "What am I with my desires?" remained absolutely without an answer. I understood that these branches of knowledge were very interesting, very attractive, but that they were clear and exact in inverse proportion to their applicability to the questions of life. The less they had to do with these questions, the clearer and more exact they were; the more they attempted to answer these questions, the obscurer and less attractive they became. If we turn to those branches of knowledge which have attempted to answer the problems of life, to physiology, psychology, biology, sociology, we meet with a striking poverty of thought, with the greatest obscurity, with an utterly unjustifiable pretension to decide questions beyond their competence, and a constant contradiction of one thinker by another, and even by himself. If we turn to the branches of knowledge which are not concerned with the problems of life, but find an answer to their own particular scientific questions, we are lost in admiration of human intellect; but we know beforehand that we shall get no answer to our questions about life itself, for these branches of knowledge directly ignore the question of life.

They say:—

"We cannot tell you what you are and why you live; such questions we do not study. But if you wish to know the laws of light, of chemical affinities, of the development of organisms; if you wish to know the laws that govern different bodies, their forms, and relations to number and size; if you wish to know the laws of your own mind,—we can give you clear, exact, and absolutely certain answers."

The relation of experimental science to the question of the meaning of life may be put thus :—

Question. “Why do I live?”

Answer. “Infinitely small particles, in infinite combinations, in infinite space and infinite time, change their forms in infinite combinations, and when you have learned the laws of these changes, you will know why you live.”

I used to say to myself when theorizing, “Spiritual causes lie at the root of man’s life and development, and they are the ideals which govern him. These ideals find expression in religion, in the sciences, in the arts, and in the forms of government. These ideals rise ever higher and higher from one stage to another, till man at last reaches his highest good. I am a part of humanity, and am therefore called upon to assist in making the ideals of humanity known and accepted.”

In the days of my mental weakness I was satisfied with this reasoning; but as soon as the problem of life really, as it were, arose within me, the whole theory fell to pieces at once. Not to speak of the dishonest inaccuracy, by which learning of this kind is made to give as general results those due to the study of but a small part of mankind; not to speak of the many contradictions among the various champions of this theory, as to what are the ideals of humanity,—the strangeness, if it be not the silliness, of this way of thinking is that, in order to answer the question which occurs to every man,—“What am I?” or “Why do I live?” or “What am I to do?”—a man must first answer this other question :—

“What is the life of that humanity, to us unknown, mankind, of which we are acquainted with but one minute part in one minute period of time?”

In order to understand what he himself is, a man must first know what that mysterious humanity is which is formed of other men like himself, ignorant of what they are.

I must confess there was a time when I believed this. That was the time when I had my own cherished ideals which determined my caprices, and I strove to evolve a

theory which should enable me to look on my fancies as a law of humanity. But as soon as the question of the meaning of life made itself clearly felt within me, this answer was scattered in dust. And I understood that, as in the experimental sciences there are real sciences and semi-sciences which try to give answers to questions not appropriate to them, so in the domain of theoretical knowledge is there a whole series of widely diffused philosophies which attempt to answer questions not appropriate to them. The semi-sciences of this domain, jurisprudence and historical sociology, endeavor to decide the questions concerning man and his life, by deciding, each in his own way, another question, that of the life of humanity as a whole.

But, as in the domain of the experimental sciences, a man who earnestly asks, "How am I to live?" cannot be satisfied with the answer, "Study in infinite space and time the infinite combinations and changes of infinite particles, and thou wilt know what thy own life means;" so a sincere man cannot be satisfied with this other answer, "Study the life of humanity as a whole, and then, though we know neither its beginning nor its end, and are ignorant of its parts, thou wilt know what thy life means."

It is the same with these semi-sciences as with the semi-experimental ones; they are full of obscurities, inaccuracies, stupidities, and contradictions, exactly in proportion to their divergence from their proper sphere. The problem of experimental science is the succession of cause and effect in material phenomena. If the question of a finite cause is raised, experimental science stumbles against an absurdity. The problem of speculative science is the conception of the uncaused existence of life. If the question of the cause of phenomena is raised, — as, for instance, of social and historical phenomena, — speculative science lands also in an absurdity.

Experimental science has positive significance, and shows the greatness of man's intellect, only when it does not inquire into finite causes; while, on the contrary, speculative science shows the greatness of man's

intellect, is a science at all only when it entirely puts aside all questions of the succession of phenomena, and looks upon man only in relation to finite causes. Such in this department of science, constituting its pole, is metaphysics, or philosophy.

This science puts the question clearly, "What am I, and what is the whole universe? Why do I and the universe exist?" and it has always answered it in the same way. Whatever name the philosopher may give to the principle of life existing in me and in all other living beings, whether he call it an idea, a substance, a spirit, or a will, he still says ever that it is a reality, and that I have a real existence; but why this is so he does not know, and does not try to explain if he is an exact thinker.

I ask: "Why should this reality be? What comes of the fact that it is and will be?" Philosophy not only cannot answer, but it can only put the same question. And if it be a true philosophy, then its whole labor consists in this, — that it should put this question clearly. And if it keep firmly to its proper sphere, it can only answer the question, "What am I and the whole universe?" by saying, "All and nothing," and to the question, "Why?" by adding, "I do not know."

Thus, however I examine and twist the speculative replies of philosophy, I never receive an answer to my question; and that, not as in the sphere of experimental knowledge, because the answer does not relate to the question, but because here, although great mental labor has been applied directly to the question, there *is* no answer, and instead of an answer I get back my own question repeated in a complicated form.

CHAPTER VI

IN my search for a solution of the problem of life, I experienced the same feeling as a man who is lost in a forest. He comes to an open plain, climbs up a tree, and sees around him a space without end, but nowhere a house — he sees clearly that there can be none; he

goes into the thick of the wood, into the darkness, and sees darkness, but again no house.

Thus had I lost my way in the forest of human knowledge, in the light of the mathematical and experimental sciences which opened out for me clear horizons where there could be no house, and in the darkness of philosophy, plunging me into a greater gloom with every step I took, until I was at last persuaded that there was, and could be, no issue.

When I followed what seemed the bright light of learning, I saw that I had only turned aside from the real question. However alluring and clear were the horizons unfolded before me, however alluring it was to plunge into the infinity of these kinds of knowledge, I saw that the clearer they were the less did I need them, the less did they give me an answer to my question.

"Well," said I to myself, "I know now all that science so obstinately seeks to learn; but an answer to my question as to the meaning of my life is not to be obtained in this way."

I saw that philosophy, notwithstanding that, or perhaps because an answer to my question had become the direct object of its inquiries, gave no answer but the one I had given to myself:—

"What is the meaning of my life?"

"It has none."

Or, "What will come of my life?"

"Nothing."

Or, "Why does all that is exist, and why do I exist?"

"Because it does exist."

When I turned to one branch of human science, I obtained an endless number of exact answers to questions I had not asked: about the chemical elements of the stars, about the movement of the sun toward the constellation Hercules, on the origin of species and of man, about the infinitely small and imponderable particles of ether; but the only answer to my question as to the meaning of my life was this:—

"You are what you call your life; that is, a temporary and accidental agglomeration of particles. The mutual

action and reaction of these particles on one another has produced what you call your life. This agglomeration will continue during a certain time, then the reciprocal action of these particles will cease, and with it will end what you call your life, and with it will end all your questions as well. You are an accidentally combined lump of something. The lump undergoes decomposition, this decomposition men call life; the lump falls asunder, decomposition ceases, and with it all doubting."

This is the answer from the clear and positive side of human knowledge, and if true to its own principles it can give no other.

Such an answer proves that the answer does not answer the question. I want to know the meaning of my life; but that it is a particle of the infinite not only does not give a meaning to it, but destroys any possibility of a meaning.

The obscure compromises which this branch of experimental exact science makes with speculative science, when it is said that the meaning of life consists in development, and the concurrent efforts made toward this development from their obscurity and inaccuracy cannot be considered an answer.

The speculative side of human knowledge, when it keeps firmly to its own principles, has everywhere and through all time given and still gives one and the same answer:—

"The world is something eternal and incomprehensible. The life of man is an inconceivable part of this inconceivable *whole*."

Again I set aside all the compromises between the speculative and experimental sciences that constitute all the ballast of the semi-sciences, of so-called jurisprudence, of political economy, and of history. In these sciences we have again a false conception of development and perfection, with this difference, that formerly it was a development of everything, and now it is a development of human life. The inaccuracy is again the same; development and perfection in infinity can have

no object, no direction, and therefore can give no answer to my question.

Whenever speculative science is exact, where philosophy is true to itself, and does not simply serve, after the manner of what Schopenhauer calls "professorial philosophy," to divide all existing phenomena into new columns, and give to them new names—wherever the philosopher does not overlook the great question of all, the answer is always the same, the answer given by Socrates, Schopenhauer, Solomon, and Buddha.

"We approach truth only in the proportion as we are farther from life," said Socrates, when preparing to die. Why do we who love truth strive for death? In order to be free from the body and all the ills that accompany life in it. If so, then, how shall we not be glad of the approach of death?

A wise man seeks death all his life, and therefore death has no terrors for him.

This is what Schopenhauer says:—

"Accept the ultimate principle of the universe as will, and in all phenomena, from the unconscious tendencies of the obscure forces of nature to the conscious activity of man, acknowledge only the objectivity of that will, and still we can never get rid of this logical consequence, that with the free denial and annihilation of that will, all phenomena also disappear, there is an end to the constant efforts and impulses now going on, without aim and without intermission, in every degree of the objectivity in which and through which the universe exists, there is an end to the varieties of successive forms, and with form vanish its postulates, space and time, even to the last and fundamental elements of form, the subject and the object. If there is no will, no phenomenal appearance, then there is no universe. The only thing that remains to us is nothing. But this passage to annihilation is opposed by our own nature, by our will to live—*Wille zum Leben*—which causes our own existence and that of the universe. That we so fear annihilation, or, what is the same, that we so wish to live, only shows that we ourselves are nothing but that wish—life—

and know nothing beyond it. Consequently, after the perfect annihilation of will, what remains to us who are full of wishes is assuredly nothing; on the other hand, for those in whom will has transformed itself and repudiated itself, the whole of this too material universe of ours, with all its suns and milky ways, is *nothing*."

"Vanity of vanities," says Solomon, "vanity of vanities; all is vanity. What profit hath a man of all his labor which he taketh under the sun? One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh: but the earth abideth forever. The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun. Is there anything whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time, which was before us. There is no remembrance of former things; neither shall there be any remembrance of things that are to come with those that shall come after.

"I the Preacher was king over Israel in Jerusalem. And I gave my heart to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all things that are done under heaven: this sore travail hath God given to the sons of man to be exercised therewith. I have seen all the works that are done under the sun; and behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit. I communed with mine own heart, saying, Lo, I am come to great estate, and have gotten more wisdom than all they that have been before me in Jerusalem: yea, my heart had great experience of wisdom and knowledge. And I gave my heart to know wisdom, and to know madness and folly: I perceived that this also is vexation of spirit. For in much wisdom is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.

"I said in mine heart, Go to now, I will prove thee with mirth, therefore enjoy pleasure: and, behold, this also is vanity. I said of laughter, It is mad: and of mirth, What doeth it? I sought in mine heart to give myself unto wine (yet acquainting mine heart with wisdom), and to lay hold on folly, till I might see what was that good for the sons of men, which they should do

under the heaven all the days of their life. I made me great works ; I builded me houses ; I planted me vineyards ; I made me gardens and orchards, and I planted trees in them of all kind of fruits ; I made me pools of water, to water therewith the wood that bringeth forth trees : I got me servants and maidens, and had servants born in my house ; also I had great possessions of great and small cattle above all that were in Jerusalem before me : I gathered me also silver and gold, and the peculiar treasure of kings and of the provinces : I gat me men singers and women singers, and the delights of the sons of men, as musical instruments, and that of all sorts. So I was great, and increased more than all that were before me in Jerusalem : also my wisdom remained with me. And whatsoever mine eyes desired I kept not from them, I withheld not mine heart from any joy. Then I looked on all the works my hands had wrought, and on the labor that I had labored to do : and behold, all was vanity and vexation of spirit, and there was no profit under the sun.

“And I turned myself to behold wisdom, and madness, and folly. And I myself perceived also that one event happeneth to them all. Then said I in my heart, As it happeneth to the fool, so it happeneth even to me ; and why was I then more wise ? Then I said in my heart, that this also is vanity. For there is no remembrance of the wise more than of the fool forever ; seeing that which now is in the days to come shall be forgotten. And how dieth the wise man ? as the fool.

“Therefore I hated life ; because the work that is wrought under the sun is grievous unto me : for all is vanity and vexation of spirit. Yea, I hated all my labor which I had taken under the sun : because I should leave it unto the man that shall be after me. For what hath man of all his labor, and of the vexation of his heart, wherein he hath labored under the sun ? For all his days are sorrows, and his travail grief ; yea, his heart taketh not rest in the night. This is also vanity. There is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink, and that he should make his soul enjoy

good in his labor. This also I saw, that it was from the hand of God.

"All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous, and to the wicked; to the good, and to the clean, and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth not: as is the good, so is the sinner; and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an oath. This is an evil among all things that are done under the sun, that there is one event unto all: yea, also the heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their heart while they live, and after that they go to the dead.

"For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope: for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun."

Thus speaks Solomon, or the one who wrote those words; and this is what an Indian sage says:—

"Sakya Muni, the young and happy heir to a great throne, from whom had been kept the sight of illness, old age, and death, once while out driving saw a horrible-looking, toothless, slaving old man. The prince from whom till then old age had been concealed was much astonished, and asked the driver what it meant, and why the man was in such a pitiable and disgusting state. When he learned that this was the common lot of all men, and that he himself, prince and young though he was, must inevitably one day be the same, he was unable to continue his drive, and ordered the carriage to be driven home, that he might have time to think it all over. He shut himself up alone and thought it over. He probably thought of something which consoled him, for again he went out for a drive, merry and happy. This time he was met by a sick man. He sees a worn-out, tottering man, who is quite blue in the face, and has dim eyes. The prince, from whom all sicknesses

had been concealed, stopped and asked what it was. When he was told that it was illness, that old men are subject to it, and he himself, sound and happy prince though he was, might fall ill the next day, he again lost all desire for amusement, and gave orders to drive home. There he again sought peace of mind, and probably found it, for soon after he started again, for the third time, in his carriage. This time, however, he saw something new also—some men were carrying something by.

“‘What is that?’

“‘A dead man.’

“‘What does dead mean?’ asked the prince; and he was told that to become one meant to become what the man before him now was.

“The prince descended and approached the body, uncovered it, and looked at it.

“‘What will become of him?’ asked the prince.

“He was told that the body would be buried in the earth.

“‘Why?’

“‘Because he will never be alive again, and only stench and worms can come from him.’

“‘And that is the lot of all men? And it will be so with me? I shall be put underground to stink and have worms come from me?’

“‘Yes.’

“‘Back! I will not go for the drive, and never will go again.’”

So Sakya Muni could find no comfort in life, and he decided that life was a very great evil, and applied all his energies to freeing himself and others from it, so that after death life should in no way be renewed, and the very root of life should be destroyed. Thus speak all the Indian sages.

Here we have the only direct answers which human wisdom can give to the problem of life.

“The life of the body is evil and a lie, and so the annihilation of that life is a good for which we ought to wish,” says Socrates.

"Life is what it ought not to be, an evil; and a passage from it into nothingness is the only good in life," says Schopenhauer.

"Everything in the world, both folly and wisdom, both riches and poverty, rejoicing and grief, — all is vanity and worthless. Man dies and nothing is left of him, and this again is vanity," says Solomon.

"To live, knowing that sufferings, illness, old age, and death are inevitable, is not possible; we must get rid of life, get rid of the possibility of living," says Buddha.

And what these powerful intellects have said, millions on millions of men have thought and felt. I also have thought and felt the same.

Thus my wanderings over the fields of knowledge not only failed to cure me of my despair, but increased it. One branch of knowledge gave no answer at all to the problem of life; another gave a direct answer which confirmed my despair, and showed that the state to which I had come was not the result of my going astray, of any mental disorder, but, on the contrary, it assured me that I was thinking rightly, that I was in agreement with the conclusions of the most powerful intellects among mankind.

I could not be deceived. All is vanity. A misfortune to be born. Death is better than life; life's burden must be got rid of.

CHAPTER VII

HAVING failed to find an explanation in knowledge, I began to seek it in life itself, hoping to find it in the men who surrounded me; and I began to watch men like myself, to observe how they lived, and how they practically treated the question that had brought me to despair.

And this is what I found among those of the same social position and culture as myself.

I found that for the people of my class there were

four means of escape from the terrible state in which we all were.

The first means of escape is through ignorance. It consists in not perceiving and understanding that life is an evil and an absurdity. People of this class — for the greater part women, or very young or very stupid men — have not understood the problem of life as it presented itself to Schopenhauer, to Solomon, and to Buddha. They see neither the dragon awaiting them, nor the mice eating through the plant to which they cling, and they lick the drops of honey. But they only lick the honey for a time; something directs their attention to the dragon and the mice, and then there is an end to their tasting. From these I could learn nothing: we cannot unknow what we do know.

The second means of escape is the Epicurean. It consists, even while we know the hopelessness of taking advantage of every good there is in life, in avoiding the sight of the dragon and mice, and in the meantime in seeking the honey as best we can, especially wherever there is most of it. Solomon points out this issue from the difficulty thus:—

“Then I commended mirth, because a man hath no better thing under the sun, than to eat, and to drink, and to be merry: for that shall abide with him of his labor the days of his life, which God giveth him under the sun. Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart. Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of the life of thy vanity, which he hath given thee under the sun, all the days of thy vanity: for that is thy portion in this life, and in thy labor which thou takest under the sun. Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest.”

Thus most of the people of our circle maintain the possibility of living. The conditions in which they are placed cause them to know more of the good than the evil of life, and their moral obtuseness enables them to

forget that all the advantages of their position are accidental, and that not all men can have harems and palaces, like Solomon; that for one man who has a thousand wives, there are a thousand men who have none, and for each palace there must be thousands of men to build it in the sweat of their brow, and that the same chance which has made me a Solomon to-day may make me Solomon's slave to-morrow. The dullness of their imagination enables these men to forget what destroyed the peace of Buddha, the inevitable sickness, old age, and death, which if not to-day, then to-morrow, must be the end of all their pleasures.

Thus think and feel the majority of the men of our time and class. That some of them call their dullness of thought and imagination by the name of positive philosophy, does not, in my opinion, separate them from those who, in order not to see the real question, lick the honey. I could not imitate such as these; not having their obtuseness of imagination, I could not artificially prevent its action. Like every man who really lives, I could not turn my eyes aside from the mice and the dragon, when I had once seen them.

The third means of escape is through strength and energy. It consists in destroying life when we have perceived that it is an evil and an absurdity. Only the rare men, strong and logical, act thus. Understanding all the stupidity of the joke that is played on us, and understanding that the happiness of the dead is more than the happiness of the living, and that it is better not to be, they thus act and put an end at once to the stupid joke, using any means of doing it—a rope round the neck, water, a knife in the heart, or a railway train. The number of those in my own class acting thus continually increases, and those that do this are for the most part in the very prime of life, with their intellectual powers in their flower, and with but few of the habits that undermine man's reason as yet formed.

I saw that this means of escape was the worthiest, and wished to make use of it.

The fourth means of escape is through weakness. It

consists, though the evil and absurdity of life are well known, in continuing to drag it out, though aware that nothing can come of it. People of this class know that death is better than life, but have not the strength of character to act as their reason dictates, to have done with deceit and kill themselves; they seem to be waiting for something to happen. This way of escape is due solely to weakness, for if I know what is better, and it is within my reach, why not seize it?.... To this class of men I myself belonged.

Thus do people of my own class, in four different ways, save themselves from a terrible contradiction. However earnestly I strained my reasoning faculties I could not find any other than these four ways. The first way is to ignore the fact that life is absurdity, vanity, and evil, — is not to know that it is better not to live. For me not to know this was impossible, and when I once saw the truth, I could not shut my eyes to it.

The second way is to make the best of life as it is, without thinking of the future. This, again, I could not do. Like Sakya Muni, I could not drive for pleasure, when I knew there were such things as old age, suffering, and death. My imagination was too lively for that. Moreover, I could not enjoy chance pleasures which fell for a few rare instants to my lot.

The third way is, knowing that life is an evil and a foolish thing, to put an end to it, to kill one's self. I understood this, but still for some reason I did not kill myself.

The fourth way is to accept life as described by Solomon and Schopenhauer, to know that it is a stupid and ridiculous joke played on one, and yet live on, to wash, dress, dine, talk, and even write books. This position was revolting and painful to me, but I remained in it.

I now see that I did not kill myself because I had, in a confused sort of way, an inkling that my ideas were wrong. However plausible and unanswerable appeared to me the idea, which I shared with the wisest on earth, that life has no meaning, I still felt a confused doubt

of the truth of my conclusions, which formed itself thus:—

“My reason tells me that life is contrary to reason. If there is nothing higher than reason — and there is nothing, and nothing can prove it — then reason is the creator of life for me; were there no reason there would be no life for me. How can this reason deny life, and at the same time be its creator? Again, from the other side, if there were no life, I should have no reason, consequently reason is the son of life. Life is all. Reason is the fruit of life, and this same reason denies life itself.”

I felt that something here was wrong. I said to myself:—

“Life undoubtedly has no meaning, and is evil, but I have lived and am still alive, and so also have lived and are living the whole human race. How is this? Why do all men live when all men are able to die? Is it that I and Schopenhauer alone are wise enough to have understood the unmeaning emptiness and evil of life?”

To see the inanity of life is a simple matter enough, and it has long been apparent to the simplest, but men have lived and still live on. Why is it men live on, and never think of calling in question the reasonableness of life?

My acquired knowledge, confirmed by the wisdom of the wisest in the world, showed me that everything on earth, organic or inorganic, was arranged with extraordinary wisdom, and that my own position alone was a foolish one. But those fools, the enormous masses of simple people, know nothing of the organic and inorganic structure of the world, but live on, and it seems to them that their lives are subjected to perfectly reasonable conditions!....

Then I thought to myself: “But what if there be something more for me to know? Surely this is the way in which Ignorance acts. Ignorance always says exactly what I do now! When Ignorance does not know anything it calls that which it does not know stupid! It really comes to this, that mankind as a whole have always lived, and are living, as if they

understood the meaning of life, for not doing so they could not live at all; whereas I say that all this life is meaningless, and that I cannot live."

No one prevents us from denying life by suicide, but, then, kill yourself and you will no longer argue about it. If you dislike life, kill yourself. If you live and cannot comprehend the meaning of life, put an end to it, and do not go on talking and writing about being unable to understand life. You have got into a gay company, in which all are well satisfied, all know what they are doing, and you alone are wearied and repelled; then get out of it!

And after all, then, what are we who, persuaded of the necessity of suicide, still cannot bring ourselves to the act, but weak, inconsistent men,—to speak more plainly, stupid men, who carry about with them their stupidity, like the fool with the placarded basket?

Our wisdom, indeed, however firmly it be grounded on truth, has not imparted to us a knowledge of the meaning of life, yet all humanity sharing in life—millions—doubt not that life has a meaning.

It is certainly true that, from the far, far distant time when that life began of which I know something, men have lived who, though they knew all the arguments about the inanity of life such as proved to me that life had no meaning, still lived on, and gave to life a meaning of their own.

Since any sort of life began for men, they have had some conception of their own about it, and have so lived down to my own time. All that is in and around me, physical or immaterial, it is all the fruit of their knowledge of life.¹ The very tools of thought with which I have judged life, and condemned it, were fashioned, not by me, but by them. I was born, and bred, and have grown up, thanks to them. They dug out the iron, taught how to hew down the forests, to tame the cows and the horses, to sow corn, to live one with another;

¹ An untranslatable pun: *plotskoye i nyeplotskoye, vsyo eto-plod* (pronounced *plot*): "Material and immaterial is all the material;" literally, "fleshly and unfleshly is all the fruit." — ED.

they gave order and form to our life; moreover, they taught me how to think and how to speak. And I, the work of their hands, their foster-child, the pupil of their thoughts and sayings, have proved to them they themselves had no meaning!

"There must be something wrong here," said I. "I have made some mistake."

I could not, however, discover where the mistake lay.

CHAPTER VIII

ALL these doubts, which I am now able to express more or less clearly, I could not then explain. Then I only felt that, however logical and unavoidable were my conclusions as to the inanity of life, confirmed as they were by the greatest thinkers, there was something wrong in them. Whether in the conclusion itself, or in the way of putting the question, I did not know; I only felt that, though my reason was entirely convinced, that was not enough.

All my reasoning could not induce me to act in accordance with my convictions, *i.e.* to kill myself.

I should not speak the truth, if I said that my reason alone brought me to the position in which I was and prevented me from suicide. Reason had been at work, no doubt, but something else had worked too, something which I can only call the consciousness of life. There also worked in me a force, which determined my attention to one thing rather than to another, and it was this that drew me out of my desperate position, and completely changed the current of my thoughts. This force led me to the idea that I, with hundreds of other men like me, did not form the whole of mankind,—that I was still ignorant of what human life was.

When I watched the narrow circle of those who were my equals in social position, I saw only people who did not understand the question, people who understood the question but kept down their understanding of it by the

intoxication of life, people who understood it and put an end to life, and people who, understanding, lived on through weakness, in despair. And I saw no others. It seemed to me that the narrow circle of learned, rich, and idle people, to which I myself belonged, formed the whole of humanity, and that the millions living outside it were animals, not men.

However strange, improbable, and inconceivable it now seems to me, that I, reasoning about life, could overlook the life of mankind surrounding me on all sides, and fall into such an error as to think that the life of a Solomon, a Schopenhauer, and my own, was the real normal life, and the life lived by unconsidered millions a circumstance unworthy of attention — however strange this appears to me now, I see that it was so. Led away by intellectual pride, it seemed to me beyond a doubt that I, with Solomon and Schopenhauer, had put the question so exactly and truly that there could be no other form of it; it seemed unquestionable that all these millions of men had failed to conceive the depth of the question, that I had sought the meaning of my life; and it never once occurred to me to think:—

“But what meaning has been given, what meaning is given now, by the millions of those who have lived and are living in the world?”

I long lived in this state of mental aberration, which, though not always openly expressed in words, is not the less common among the most learned and most liberal men. But whether, owing to my strange kind of instinctive affection for the laboring classes, which impelled me to understand them, and to see that they are not so stupid as we think, or owing to the sincerity of my conviction that I could know nothing beyond the advisability of hanging myself, I felt that, if I wished to live and understand the meaning of life, I must seek it not amongst those who have lost the meaning of life, and wish to kill themselves, but amongst the millions of the living and the dead who have made our life what it is, and on whom now rests the burden of our life and their own.

So I watched the life common to such enormous numbers of the dead and the living, the life of simple, unlearned, and poor men, and found something quite different. I saw that all these milliards, who are alive and have lived, with rare exceptions, did not come into my classification; I could not count them among those who do not understand the question, because they not only put it, but answer it, with extraordinary clearness. I could not call them Epicureans, because their life has far more of privation and suffering than of enjoyment; to count them amongst those who, against their reason, live through a life without meaning, was still less possible, because every act of their lives, and death itself, is explained by them. Self-murder they regard as the greatest of crimes. It appeared that throughout mankind there is a knowledge of the meaning of life which I had neglected and despised. It resulted, that the knowledge based on reason denies a meaning to life, and excludes life; while the meaning given to life by the milliards that form the great whole of humanity is founded on a despised and fallacious knowledge.

The knowledge based on reason, the knowledge of the learned and the wise, denies a meaning in life, while the great mass of men, all humanity, have an unreasoning knowledge of life which gives a meaning to it.

This unreasoning knowledge is the faith which I could not but reject. This is a God, one and yet three; this is the creation in six days, devils and angels, — and all that I cannot accept while I keep my senses!

My position was terrible. I knew that from the knowledge which reason has given man, I could get nothing but the denial of life, and from faith nothing but the denial of reason, which last was even more impossible than the denial of life. By the knowledge founded on reason it was proved that life is an evil and that men know it to be so, that men may cease to live if they will, but that they have lived and they go on living — I myself lived on, though I had long known that life was meaningless and evil. If I went by faith it resulted that, in

order to understand the meaning of life, I should have to abandon reason, the very part of me that required a meaning in life!

CHAPTER IX

I WAS stopped by a contradiction from which there were only two ways of escape: either what I called reasonable was not so reasonable as I thought it, or what I called unreasonable was not so unreasonable as I thought it. I began to verify the process of thinking through which I had been led to the conclusions of reasoning knowledge.

On doing this, I found the process complete and flawless. The conclusion that life was nothing was unavoidable; but I discovered a mistake. The mistake was that I had not confined my thoughts to the question proposed. The question was, why should I live, *i.e.* what of real and imperishable will come of my shadowy and perishable life — what meaning has my finite existence in the infinite universe? And I had tried to answer this by studying life.

It was evident that the decision of any number of questions concerning life could not satisfy me, because my question, however simple it seemed at first, included the necessity of explaining the finite by infinity, and the contrary.

I asked myself what meaning my life had apart from time, causation, and space. But I replied to my question: what is the meaning of life in respect to time, causation, and space? The result was that after long and earnest efforts of thinking, I could only answer — none at all.

Through all my reasoning with myself I constantly compared, and I could not do otherwise, the finite with the finite, and the infinite with the infinite, and the conclusion was consequently inevitable: a force is a force, matter is matter, will is will, infinity is infinity, nothing is nothing, — and there was no getting beyond

that. It was like what happens in mathematics, when thinking to resolve an equation we get identical terms. The process of solution is correct, but our answer is $a = a$, or $x = x$, or $0 = 0$. This happened to me in my inquiries into the meaning of my life. The answers given by all science to the question were "identity."

And in reality knowledge founded strictly on reason, which, like that carried on by Descartes, begins with absolute doubt of everything, throws aside all knowledge founded on faith, and reconstructs all in accordance with the laws of reason and experience, and it can give no other answer to the question about the meaning of life than the one which I myself obtained—an indefinite one.

It seemed to me at first that science did give a positive answer, the answer of Schopenhauer: life has no meaning, it is an evil; but, when I inquired more closely into the matter, I perceived that the answer was not positive, that it was my own feeling alone made me think it so. The answer boldly expressed in the same terms as that given by the Brahmins, and Solomon, and Schopenhauer, is only an indefinite one,—the identity of 0 and 0, life is nothing. Thus philosophical knowledge denies nothing, but merely answers that the question cannot be decided by it,—that the matter remains indefinite.

When I had come to this conclusion, I understood that it was useless to seek an answer to my question from knowledge founded on reason, and that the answer given by this form of knowledge is only an indication that no answer can be obtained till the question is put differently,—till the question be made to include the relation between the finite and the infinite. I also understood that, however unreasonable and monstrous the answers given by faith, they have the advantage of bringing into every question the relation of the finite to the infinite, without which there can be no answer.

However I may put the question, How am I to live? the answer is, "By the law of God."

Will anything real and positive come of my life, and what?

Eternal torment, or eternal bliss.

What meaning is there not to be destroyed by death?

Union with an infinite God, paradise.

In this way I was compelled to admit that, besides the reasoning knowledge, which I once thought the only true knowledge, there was in every living man another kind of knowledge, an unreasoning one, — faith, — which gives a possibility of living.

All the unreasonableness of faith remained for me the same as ever, but I could not help acknowledging that faith alone gave man answers as to the questions of life, and consequently the possibility of living.

Reasoning knowledge brought me to the conclusion that life was meaningless, and my life stood still, and I wished to put an end to myself. When I looked at the men around me, at humanity as a whole, I saw that men lived, and that they know the meaning of life. For other men, as for myself, faith gave a meaning to life and a possibility of living.

On examining farther into life in other countries than my own, as well among my contemporaries as among those who have passed away, I found the same thing. From the beginning of the human race, wherever there is life there is faith which makes life possible, and everywhere the leading characteristics of faith are the same.

Whatever answers any kind of faith ever gives to any one, every one of these answers gives an infinite meaning to the finite life of man, a meaning which is not destroyed by suffering, privation, and death. In faith, therefore, alone is found the possibility of living and a meaning in life. What is this faith? I understood that faith is not only the manifestation of things unseen, is not only a revelation (that is only a description of one of the signs of faith), is not the relation of man to God (faith must first be determined, and then God, and not faith through God), and is not only acquiescence with what has been told to man, as faith is most frequently understood to

be,—but faith is the knowledge of the meaning of human life, in consequence of which man does not destroy himself, but lives. Faith is the force of life.

If a man lives, he believes in something. If he did not believe that there was something to live for, he would not live. If he does not see and understand the unreality of the finite, he believes in the finite; if he sees that unreality, he must believe in the infinite. Without faith it is impossible to live.

I then went back over all the past stages of my mental state, and was terrified. It was now clear to me that for any one to live, it was necessary for him either not to see infinity, or to accept an explanation of the meaning of life which should equalize the finite and the infinite. Such an explanation I had, but I had no need of it while I believed in the finite, and I began to apply to my explanation the tests of reason, and in the light of reason all former explanations were shown to be worthless. But the time when I ceased to believe in the finite passed, even then I tried to raise on the foundations of reason and out of what I knew an explanation which should give a meaning to life, but I tried in vain. In company with the greatest intellects among men I came only to the conclusion that $0 = 0$, and, though nothing else could have come of it, I was much astonished to have obtained such an answer to my problem.

What did I do when I sought an answer in the study of experimental science? I wanted to know why I lived, and to that end I studied everything outside myself. Clearly in this way I might learn much, but nothing of that which I needed.

What did I do when I sought an answer in the study of philosophy? I studied the thoughts of others in the same position as myself, and who had no answer to the question — “Why do I live?” Clearly I could in this way learn nothing but what I myself knew, namely, that it was impossible to know anything.

What am I?—a part of the infinite. In those few words lay the whole problem.

Could it be that mankind had only now begun to put this question? Could it be that no one before myself had asked this simple question, that must occur to the mind of every intelligent child?

Why! since men have been this question has been put, and since men have been it has been assuredly understood that the decision of this question is equally unsatisfactory, whether the finite be compared with the finite, and the infinite with the infinite, and since men have been, the relations of the finite to the infinite have been sought and expressed.

All these conceptions of the equality of the finite and the infinite, through which we receive the ideas of life, of God, of freedom, of good, we submit to logical analysis. And these conceptions will not bear the tests of reason.

If it were not so terrible, it would be laughable to think of the pride and self-confidence with which we, like children, pull out our watches, take away the spring, make a plaything of them, and are then astonished that they will no longer keep time.

The decision of the contradiction between the finite and the infinite, and such an answer to the question of what is life as shall enable us to live, is essential and precious to us. The only answer is the one to be found everywhere, always, and among all nations, an answer which has come down to us from the times in which the origin of human life is lost, an answer so difficult that we could never ourselves have come to it — this answer we in our careless indifference get rid of, by again raising the question which presents itself to every one, but which no one can answer.

The conception of an infinite God, of the divinity of the soul, of the way in which the affairs of men are related to God, of the unity and reality of the spirit, man's conception of moral good and evil, — these are conceptions worked out through the infinite mental labors of mankind; conceptions without which there would be no life, without which I should not myself exist, and yet I reject all this, the labor of the whole

human race, and venture on working out the problem again in my own way alone.

I did not at the time think so, but the germs of these thoughts were already within me. I understood (1) that the position assumed by Schopenhauer, Solomon, and myself, notwithstanding all our wisdom, was foolish: we understand that life is an evil, and yet we live. This is clearly foolish, because if life is foolish, and I care so much for reason, life should be put an end to, and then there would be no one to deny it.

(2) I understood that all our arguments turned in a charmed circle, like a cog-wheel the teeth of which no longer catch in another. However much and however well we reason, we get no answer to our question; it will always be $0 = 0$, and consequently our method is probably wrong.

(3) I began to understand that in the answers given by faith was to be found the deepest source of human wisdom, that I had no reasonable right to reject them on the ground of reason, and that these principle answers alone solved the problem of life.

CHAPTER X

I UNDERSTOOD this, but it did not make it any easier for me.

I was now ready to accept any faith that did not require of me a direct denial of reason, for that would be to act a lie; and I studied Buddhism and Mohammedanism in their books, and especially also Christianity, both in its writings and in the lives of its professors around me.

I naturally turned my attention at first to the believers in my own immediate circle, to learned men, to orthodox divines, to the older monks, to the orthodox divines of a new shade of doctrine, the so-called New Christians, who preach salvation through faith in a Redeemer. I seized upon these believers, and asked them what they believed in, and what for them gave a meaning to life.

Notwithstanding that I made every possible concession, that I avoided all disputes, I could not accept the faith of these men. I saw that what they called their faith did not explain, but obscured, the meaning of life, and that they professed it, not in order to answer the questions as to life which had attracted me toward faith, but for some other purpose to which I was a stranger.

I remember the painful feeling of horror with which I returned to the old feeling of despair, after the hopes which I experienced many, many times in my relations with these people.

The more minutely they laid their doctrines before me, the more clearly I perceived their error, the more I lost all hope of finding in their faith an explanation of the meaning of life.

I was not so much revolted by the unnecessary and unreasonable doctrines which they mingled with the Christian truths always so dear to me, as by the fact that their lives were like my own, the only difference being that they did not live according to the principles which they professed. I was clearly conscious that they deceived themselves, and that for them, as for myself, there was no other meaning to life than to live while they lived, and take each for himself all that his hands could lay hold on. I saw this, because if the ideas of life which they conceived had done away with the fear of privation, suffering, and death, they would not have feared them. But these believers of our class, the same as I myself, lived in comfort and abundance, struggled to increase and preserve it, were afraid of privation, suffering, and death; and again, like myself and all the rest of us unbelievers, satisfied the lusts of the flesh, and led lives as evil as, if not worse than, those of infidels themselves.

No arguments were able to convince me of the sincerity of the faith of these men. Only actions, proving their conception of life to have destroyed the fear of poverty, illness, and death, so strong in myself, could have convinced me, and such actions I could not see among the various believers of our class. Such actions,

I saw, indeed, among the open infidels of my own class in life, but never among the so-called believers of our class.

I understood, then, that the faith of these men was not the faith which I sought; that it was no faith at all, but only one of the Epicurean consolations of life. I understood that this faith, if it could not really console, could at least soothe the repentant mind of a Solomon on his deathbed; but that it could not serve the enormous majority of mankind, who are born, not to be comforted by the labors of others, but to create a life for themselves. For mankind to live, for it to continue to live and be conscious of the meaning of its life, all these millions must have another and a true conception of faith. It was not, then, the fact that Solomon, Schopenhauer, and I had not killed ourselves, which convinced me that faith existed, but the fact that these millions have lived and are now living, carrying along with them on the impulse of their life both Solomon and ourselves.

I began to draw nearer to the believers among the poor, the simple, and the ignorant, the pilgrims, the monks, the raskolniks, and the peasants. The doctrines of these men of the people, like those of the pretended believers of my own class, were Christian. Here also much that was superstitious was mingled with the truths of Christianity, but with this difference, that the superstition of the believers of our class was entirely unnecessary to them, and never influenced their lives beyond serving as a kind of Epicurean distraction; while the superstition of the believing laboring class was so interwoven with their lives that it was impossible to conceive them without it—it was a necessary condition of their living at all. The whole life of the believers of our class was in flat contradiction with their faith, and the whole life of the believers of the people was a confirmation of the meaning of life which their faith gave them.

Thus I began to study the lives and the doctrines of the people, and the more I studied the more I became convinced that a true faith was among them, that their faith

was for them a necessary thing, and alone gave them a meaning in life and a possibility of living. In direct opposition to what I saw in our circle — where life without faith was possible, and where not one in a thousand professed himself a believer — amongst the people there was not a single unbeliever in a thousand. In direct opposition to what I saw in our circle — where a whole life is spent in idleness, amusement, and dissatisfaction with life — I saw among the people whose lives passed in heavy labor and unrepining content. In direct opposition to what I saw in our circle — men resisting and indignant with the privations and sufferings of their lot — the people unhesitatingly and unresistingly accepting illness and sorrow, in the quiet and firm conviction that all these must be and could not be otherwise, and that all was for the best. In contradiction to the theory that the less learned we are the less we understand the meaning of life, and see in our sufferings and death but an evil joke, these men of the people live, suffer, and draw near to death, in quiet confidence and oftenest with joy. In contradiction to the fact that an easy death, without terror or despair, is a rare exception in our class, a death which is uneasy, rebellious, and sorrowful is among the people the rarest exception of all.

These people, deprived of all that for us and for Solomon makes the only good in life, and experiencing at the same time the highest happiness, form the great majority of mankind. I looked more widely around me, I studied the lives of the past and contemporary masses of humanity, and I saw that, not two or three, or ten, but hundreds, thousands, millions had so understood the meaning of life that they were able both to live and to die. All these men, infinitely divided by manners, powers of mind, education, and position, all alike in opposition to my ignorance, were well acquainted with the meaning of life and of death, quietly labored, endured privation and suffering, lived and died, and saw in all this, not a vain, but a good thing.

I began to grow attached to these men. The more I learned of their lives, the lives of the living and of the

dead of whom I read and heard, the more I liked them, and the easier I felt it so to live. I lived in this way during two years, and then there came a change which had long been preparing in me, and the symptoms of which I had always dimly felt: the life of our circle of rich and learned men, not only became repulsive, but lost all meaning. All our actions, our reasoning, our science and art, all appeared to me in a new light. I understood that it was all child's play, that it was useless to seek a meaning in it. The life of the working-classes, of the whole of mankind, of those that create life, appeared to me in its true significance. I understood that this was life itself, and that the meaning given to this life was true, and I accepted it.

CHAPTER XI

WHEN I remembered how these very doctrines had repelled me, how senseless they had seemed when professed by men whose lives were spent in opposition to them, and how these same doctrines had attracted me and seemed reasonable when I saw men living in accordance with them, I understood why I had once rejected them and thought them unmeaning, why I now adopted them and thought them full of meaning. I understood that I had erred, and how I had erred. I had erred, not so much through having thought incorrectly, as through having lived ill. I understood that the truth had been hidden from me, not so much because I had erred in my reasoning, as because I had led the exceptional life of an epicure bent on satisfying the lusts of the flesh. I understood that my question, "What is my life," and the answer, "An evil," were in accordance with the truth of things. The mistake lay in my having applied to life in general an answer which only concerned myself. I had asked what my own life was, and the answer was "An evil and absurdity." Exactly so, my life—a life of indulgence, of sensuality—was an absurdity and an evil; and the answer, "Life is meaningless and evil,"

therefore, referred only to my own life, and not to human life in general.

I understood the truth which I afterwards found in the Gospel: "That men loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil. For every man that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved."

I understood that, for the meaning of life to be understood, it was necessary first that life should be something more than evil and meaningless, and afterwards that there should be the light of reason to understand it. I understood why I had so long been circling round this self-evident truth without apprehending it, and that if we would think and speak of the life of mankind, we must think and speak of that life as a whole, and not merely of the life of certain parasites on it.

This truth was always a truth, as $2 \times 2 = 4$, but I had not accepted it, because, besides acknowledging $2 \times 2 = 4$, I should have been obliged to acknowledge that I was evil. It was of more importance to me to feel that I was good, more binding on me, than to believe $2 \times 2 = 4$. I loved good men, I hated myself, and I accepted truth. Now it was all clear to me.

Now if the question, "What is life?" were asked of himself by an executioner, who passes his life in torturing and cutting off heads, or by a confirmed drunkard, or by a crazy man who has spent his whole life in a darkened chamber, hating that chamber and imagining that he would perish if he left it, evidently he could get no other answer to his question, "What is life?" than that life is the greatest of evils, and the crazy man's answer would be a true one, but only for himself. Here, then, was I such a crazy man? Were all of us rich, clever, idle men, crazy like this?

I understood at last that we actually were; that I, at any rate, was. In fact the bird is so constituted that it must fly, pick up its food, build its nest, and when I see the bird doing this I rejoice in its joy. The goat, the hare, the wolf, are so constituted that they must feed and multiply, and bring up their young; and when they

do this, I have a firm conviction that they are happy, and that their life is reasonable.

What, then, must man do? He also must gain his living like the animals, but with this difference, that he will perish if he attempt it alone; he must labor, not for himself, but for all. And when he does so, I am firmly convinced he is happy, and his life is reasonable.

What had I done during my thirty years of conscious life? I had not only not helped the life of others, I had done nothing for my own. I had lived the life of a parasite, and when I asked myself why I lived at all I received the answer, "There is no reason why." If the meaning of the life of man lies in his having to work out his life himself, how could I, who during thirty years had done my best to ruin my own life and that of others, expect to receive any other answer than this, — that my life was an evil and an absurdity?

It was an evil, an absurdity.

The life of the world goes on through the will of some one. Some one makes our own life and that of the universe his own inscrutable care. To have a hope of understanding what that will means, we must first fulfil it, we must do what is required of us. Unless I do what is required of me, I can never know what that may be, and much less know what is required of us all and of the whole universe.

If a naked, hungry beggar be taken from the cross-roads into an enclosed space in a splendid establishment, to be well clothed and fed, and made to work a handle up and down, it is evident that the beggar, before seeking to know why he has been taken, why he must work the handle, whether the arrangements of the establishment are reasonable or not, must first move the handle. If he move the handle he will find that the handle works a pump, the pump draws up water, and the water flows over garden beds. Then he will be taken from the covered well and set to other work; he will gather fruits and enter into the joy of his lord, and as he passes from less to more important labors, he will understand better and better the arrangements of the whole estab-

ishment; and he will take his share in them without once stopping to ask why he is there, nor will he ever think of reproaching the lord of that place.

And thus it is with those that do the will of their master; no reproaches come from simple untaught working-men, from those we regard as brutes. But we the while, wise men that we are, devour the goods of the master, and do nothing of that which he wills us to do; but instead, seat ourselves in a circle to argue why we should move the handle, for that seems to us stupid. And when we have thought it all out, what is our conclusion? Why, that the master is stupid, or that there is none, while we ourselves are wise, only we feel that we are fit for nothing, and that we must somehow or other get rid of ourselves.

CHAPTER XII

My conviction of the error into which all knowledge based on reason must fall assisted me in freeing myself from the seductions of idle reasoning. The conviction that a knowledge of truth can be gained only by living, led me to doubt the justness of my own life; but I had only to get out of my own particular groove, and look around me, to observe the simple life of the real working-class, to understand that such a life was the only real one. I understood that, if I wished to understand life and its meaning, I must live, not the life of a parasite, but a real life; and, accepting the meaning given to it by the combined lives of those that really form the great human whole, submit it to a close examination.

At the time I am speaking of, the following was my position:—

During the whole of that year, when I was asking myself almost every minute whether I should or should not put an end to it all with a cord or a pistol, during the time my mind was occupied with the thoughts which I have described, my heart was oppressed by a torment-

ing feeling. This feeling I cannot describe otherwise than as a searching after God.

This search after a God was not an act of my reason, but a feeling, and I say this advisedly, because it was opposed to my way of thinking; it came from the heart. It was a feeling of dread, or orphanhood, of isolation amid things all apart from me, and of hope in a help I knew not from whom.

Though I was well convinced of the impossibility of proving the existence of God — Kant had shown me, and I had thoroughly grasped his reasoning, that this did not admit of proof — I still sought to find a God, still hoped to do so, and still, from the force of former habits, addressed myself to one in prayer, whom I sought, and did not find.

At times I went over in my mind the arguments of Kant and of Schopenhauer, showing the impossibility of proving the existence of the Deity; at times I began to test their arguments and refute them.

I would say to myself that causation is not in the same category of thought as space and time. If I am, there is a cause of my being, and that the cause of all causes. That cause of all things is what is called God; and I dwelt on this idea, and strove with all my being to reach a consciousness of the presence of this cause.

As soon as I became conscious that there is such a power over me, I felt a possibility of living. Then I asked myself:—

“What is this cause, this power? How am I to think of it? What is my relation to what I call God?”

And only the old familiar answer came into my mind, “He is the creator, the giver of all.”

This answer did not satisfy me, and I felt that what was necessary for life was failing me, a great horror came over me, and I began to pray to Him whom I sought, that He would help me. But the more I prayed, the clearer it became that I was not heard, that there was no one to whom one could turn. With despair in my heart that there was no God, I cried:—

"Lord, have mercy on me, and save! O Lord, my God, teach me!"

But no one had mercy on me, and I felt that my life had come to a standstill.

But again and again, from various other directions, I came back to the same conviction that I could not have appeared on earth without any motive or meaning, — that I could not be such a fledgling dropped from a nest as I felt myself to be. What if I cry, as the fallen fledgling does on its back in the high grass? It is because I know that a mother bore me, cared for me, fed me, and loved me. Where is she, where is that mother? If I have been thrown out, then who threw me? I cannot help seeing that some one who loved me brought me into being. Who is that some one? Again the same answer — God. He knows and sees my search, my despair, my struggle. "He is," I said to myself. I had only to admit that for an instant to feel that life re-
arose in me, to feel the possibility of existing and the joy of it.

Then, again, from the conviction of the existence of God, I passed to the consideration of our relation toward Him, and again I had before me the triune God, our Creator, who sent His Son, the Redeemer. Again, this God, apart from me and from the world, melted from before my eyes as ice melts; again there was nothing left, again the source of life dried up. I fell once more into despair, and felt that I had nothing to do but to kill myself, while, worst of all, I felt also that I should never do it.

Not twice, not three times, but tens, hundreds, of times did I pass through these alternations, — now of joy and excitement, now of despair and of consciousness of the impossibility of life.

I remember one day in the early springtime I was alone in the forest listening to the woodland sounds, and thinking only of one thing, the same of which I had constantly thought for two years — I was again seeking for a God.

I said to myself: —

“Very good, there is no God, there is none with a reality apart from my own imaginings, none as real as my own life — there is none such. Nothing, no miracles can prove there is, for miracles only exist in my own unreasonable imagination.”

And then I asked myself :—

“But my idea of the God whom I seek, whence comes it?”

And again at this thought arose the joyous billows of life. All around me seemed to revive, to have a new meaning. My joy, though, did not last long. Reason continued its work :—

“The idea of a God is not God. The idea is what goes on within myself ; the idea of God is an idea which I am able to rouse in my mind or not as I choose ; it is not what I seek, something without which life could not be.”

Then again all seemed to die around and within me, and again I wished to kill myself.

After this I began to retrace the process which had gone on within myself, the hundred times repeated discouragement and revival. I remembered that I had lived only when I believed in a God. As it was before, so it was now ; I had only to know God, and I lived ; I had only to forget Him, not to believe in Him, and I died.

What was this discouragement and revival? I do not live when I lose faith in the existence of a God ; I should long ago have killed myself, if I had not had a dim hope of finding Him. I really live only when I am conscious of Him and seek Him. “What more, then, do I seek?” A voice seemed to cry within me, “This is He, He without whom there is no life. To know God and to live are one. God is life.”

Live to seek God, and life will not be without God. And stronger than ever rose up life within and around me, and the light that then shone never left me again.

Thus I was saved from self-murder. When and how this change in me took place I could not say. As gradually, imperceptibly as life had decayed in me, till I reached the impossibility of living, till life stood still,

and I longed to kill myself, so gradually and imperceptibly I felt the glow and strength of life return to me.

And strangely enough this power of life which came back to me was not new ; it was old enough, for I had been led away by it in the earlier part of my life.

I returned, as it were, to the past, to childhood and my youth. I returned to faith in that Will which brought me into being and which required something of me ; I returned to the belief that the one single aim of life should be to become better, that is, to live in accordance with that Will ; I returned to the idea that the expression of that Will was to be found in what, in the dim obscurity of the past, the great human unity had fashioned for its own guidance ; in other words, I returned to a belief in God, in moral perfectibility, and in the tradition which gives a meaning to life. The difference was that formerly I had unconsciously accepted this, whereas now I knew that without it I could not live.

The state of mind in which I then was may be likened to the following : It was as if I had suddenly found myself sitting in a boat which had been pushed off from some shore unknown to me, had been shown the direction of the opposite shore, had had oars put into my inexperienced hands, and had been left alone. I had used the oars as best I could and rowed on ; but the farther I went toward the center, the stronger became the current which carried me out of my course, and the oftener I met other navigators, like myself, carried away by the stream. There were here and there solitary navigators who had continued to row hard, there were others who had thrown down their oars, there were large boats, and enormous ships crowded with men ; some struggled against the stream, others glided on with it. The farther I got, the more, as I watched the long line floating down the current, I forgot the course pointed out to me as my own.

In the very middle of the stream, amid the crowd of boats and vessels floating down, I had altogether lost the course and thrown down my oars. From all sides the

joyful and exulting navigators, as they rowed or sailed down-stream, with one voice assured me and one another that there could be no other direction. And I believed them, and let myself go with them. I was carried far, so far that I heard the roar of the rapids in which I was bound to perish, and I already saw boats that had been broken up within them.

Then I came to myself. It was long before I clearly comprehended what had happened. I saw before me nothing but the destruction toward which I was hurrying, which I dreaded, and I saw no salvation and knew not what I was to do! But on looking back, I saw a countless multitude of boats engaged in a ceaseless struggle against the force of the torrent, and then I remembered all about the shore, the oars, and the course, and at once I began to row hard up the stream and again toward the shore.

That shore was God, that course was tradition, those oars were the free will given me to make for the shore to seek union with the Deity.

CHAPTER XIII

AND thus the vital force was renewed in me, and I began again to live. I renounced the life of our class, for I had come to confess that it was not life, but only the semblance of life, that its superfluous luxuries prevent the possibility of understanding life, and that in order to understand life, I must understand not the life of exceptional people, the parasites, but the life of the simple working-classes, the life that fashions life, and gives it the meaning which the working-classes accept. The simple laboring men around me were the Russian people, and I turned to this people and to the meaning which it gives to life.

This meaning, if it can be expressed, was as follows:—

Every man has come into this world by the will of God, and God has so created man that every man is able to ruin or to save his soul. The problem of man's

life being to save his soul, in order to save his soul, he must live after God's word: to live after God's word, he must renounce all the pleasures of life, must labor, be humble, endure, and be meek. This, to the people, is the meaning of the whole system of faith, as it has come down to them through, and is now given them by, the pastors of their Church and the traditions which exist among them.

This meaning was clear to me, and dear to my heart. This popular faith, however, among the non-dissenting communities in which I lived, was inextricably bound up with something else so incapable of being explained that it repelled me: the sacraments, the services of the Church, the fasts, and the bowing before relics and images. The people were unable to separate these things, and no more could I. Though many things belonging to the faith of the people appeared strange to me, I accepted everything, I attended the church services, prayed morning and evening, fasted, prepared for the communion; and, while doing all this, for the first time felt that my reason found nothing to object to. What had formerly seemed to me impossible, now roused no opposition in me.

The position which I occupied with relation to questions of faith had become quite different to what it once was. Formerly, life itself had seemed to me full of meaning, and faith an arbitrary assertion of certain useless and unreasonable propositions which had no direct bearing on life. I had tried to find out their meaning; and once convinced they had none, had thrown them aside. Now, on the contrary, I knew for certain that my life had not and could not have any meaning, and that the propositions of faith not only appeared no longer useless to me, but had been shown beyond dispute by my own experience to be that which alone gave a meaning to life. Formerly I looked on them as a worthless, illegible scrawl; but now if I did not understand them, still I knew that they had a meaning, and I said to myself that I must learn to understand them.

I reasoned thus:—

“Faith springs, like man and his reason, from the mysterious first cause. That first cause is God, the cause of the body and the mind of man. As my body proceeded through successive gradations from God to me, so have my reason and my conception of life proceeded from Him, and consequently the steps of this process of development cannot be false. All that men sincerely believe in must be true; it may be differently expressed, but it cannot be a lie, and consequently, if it seem to me a lie, that must be because I do not understand it.”

Again, I said to myself:—

“The true office of any faith is to give to life a meaning which death cannot destroy. It is only natural that for faith to give an answer to the question of the king dying amid every luxury, of the old and labor-worn slave, of the unthinking child, of the aged sage, of the half-witted old crone, of the happy woman full of the strong passions of youth, of all men under all possible differences of position and education,—it is only natural that, if there be but one answer to the one eternally repeated question—‘Why do I live, and what will come of my life?’—the answer, though one and the same in reality, should be infinitely varied in its phenomena; that, in exact proportion to its unvarying unity, to its truth, and its depth, it should appear strange, and even monstrous, in the attempts to find due expression, which are owing to the bringing-up and the social state of each individual answerer.”

But these arguments, which justified the oddities of the ritual side of faith, were still insufficient to make me feel that I had a right, in a matter like faith, now become the one business of my life, to take part in acts of which I was still doubtful. I desired, with all the powers of my soul, to be in a condition to unite with the people, conforming to the rites which they practised, but I could not do it. I felt that I should lie to myself, and mock what I held most sacred, if I did this thing.

At this point our new Russian theologians came to my assistance.

According to the explanation of these divines, the fundamental dogma of faith is the infallibility of the Church. From the acceptance of this dogma follows, as a necessary consequence, the truth of all that is taught by the Church. The Church, as the assembly of believers united in love, and consequently possessing true knowledge, became the foundation of my faith. I said to myself: "Divine truth cannot be attained by any one man, — it can be reached only by the union of all men through love. In order to attain the truth, we must not go each his own way; and, to avoid division, we must have love one to the other, and bear with things which we do not agree with. Truth is revealed in love, and, therefore, if we do not obey the ordinances of the Church, we destroy love; but if love is destroyed we are deprived of the possibility of knowing the truth."

At the time I did not perceive the sophism involved in this reasoning. I did not then see that union through love may develop love to the highest degree, but can never give the Divine Truth, as stated in the words of the Nicene Creed, — I did not see that love can never make any particular form of creed binding on all believers. I did not then see error in this reasoning, and, thanks to it, I was able to accept and practise all the rites of the Orthodox Church, but without understanding the greater part of them. I struggled then, with all the powers of my soul, to avoid all discussions, all contradictions, and endeavored to explain, as reasonably as I could, all the Church doctrines that presented any difficulty.

While thus fulfilling the ordinances of the Church, I submitted my reason to the tradition adopted by the mass of my fellow-men. I united myself to my ancestors, — to those I loved, — my father, mother, and grandparents. They and all before them lived, and believed, and brought me into being. I joined the millions of the people whom I respect. Moreover, there was nothing bad in all this, for bad with me meant the indulgence of the lusts of the flesh. When I got up early to attend

divine service, I knew that I was doing well, if it were only because I tamed my intellectual pride for the sake of a closer union with my ancestors and contemporaries, and, in order to seek for a meaning in life, sacrificed my bodily comfort.

It was the same with preparing for the communion, the daily reading of prayers, with genuflections, and the observance of all the fasts. However insignificant the sacrifices were, they were made in a good cause. I prepared for the communion, fasted, and observed regular hours for prayer both at home and at church. While listening to the church service, I weighed every word, and gave it a meaning whenever I could. At mass the words which appeared to me to have most importance were the following:—

“Let us love one another in unity.” What follows—the confession of belief in the unity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—I passed over, because I could not understand it.

CHAPTER XIV

IT was so necessary for me at that time to believe in order to live, that I unconsciously concealed from myself the contradictions and the obscurities in the doctrines.

But this interpretation of the ritual had its limits. If the Liturgy became clearer and clearer to me in its principal expressions; if I gave a kind of meaning to such expressions as “Remembering our Sovereign Lady, the most Holy Mother of God, and all the Saints, let us devote ourselves, each other, and our whole lives to the Christ God”; if I explained the frequent repetition of prayers for the Tsar and his family by the fact that they were more exposed to temptation than others, and were therefore more in need of prayer, and the prayers for victory over our enemies and opponents to mean victory over the principle of evil; these prayers and others like the hymn of the Cherubim, and all the mystery of the

bread and wine, the adoration of the Virgin and others — in short, two-thirds of the whole service — either remained for me without an explanation at all, or made me feel that the only one I could apply to them was false, while to lie was to break off my connection with God, and lose utterly the possibility of believing.

I felt the same at the celebration of the principal Church holidays. To “remember the Sabbath day,” that is, to consecrate one day to communion with God, was comprehensible to me. The great holiday, however, was in remembrance of the Resurrection, the reality of which I could neither imagine nor understand. This gave a name to the holiday in each week, to the Sunday. And on this day the sacrament of the Eucharist was celebrated, a mystery which to me was utterly inconceivable. The other twelve holidays, with the exception of Christmas, were all in remembrance of miracles, which I tried not to think of in order not to deny: the Ascension, Pentecost, Epiphany, the Intercession of the Virgin, and so on.

On these holidays I felt that the greatest importance was given to what I believed to be of the least, and I either held fast to the explanation that quieted me most, or else shut my eyes so as not to see what disquieted me.

This feeling came upon me strongest whenever I took part in the most ordinary, and, generally considered, the most important, sacraments, as christening and the holy communion. Here I had to do with nothing incomprehensible, but with what was easy to understand: such acts appeared to me a delusion, and I was on the horns of a dilemma — to lie, or to reject.

I shall never forget the painful feeling I experienced when I took the communion for the first time after many years. The service, the confession, the collects, all this was understood by me, and produced the glad conviction that the meaning of life lay open to me. The communion I explained to myself as an action done in remembrance of Christ, and as signifying a cleansing from sin and a complete acceptance of Christ’s teach-

ing. If this explanation was artificial, I, at least, was not troubled by its artificiality. It was such happiness for me to humble myself with a quiet heart before the confessor, a simple and mild priest, and, repenting of my sins, to lay bare all the mire of my soul; it was such happiness to be united in spirit with the meek Fathers of the Church who composed these prayers; such happiness to be one with all who have believed and who do believe, that I could not feel my explanation was artificial.

But when I drew near to the *tsarskiya dveri*, "the holy gates," and the priest called on me to repeat that I believed that what I was about to swallow was the real body and blood, it cut me to the heart; it was a false note, though small; it was no unconsidered word; it was the cruel demand of one who had evidently never known what faith was.

I now allow myself to say that it was a cruel demand, but then I did not think so; it was only unspeakably painful. I was no longer in that position where I had been in my youth, thinking that all was clear in life; I had been drawn toward faith because outside it I had found nothing, assuredly nothing but ruin; and as I could not throw faith aside, I had submitted. I had found in my soul a feeling which had helped me to do this. It was a feeling of self-abasement and submission. I humbled myself, I swallowed the blood and the body without any mocking thoughts in the wish to believe, but the shock had been received, and knowing beforehand what awaited me, I could never go a second time.

I still continued an exact observance of the rites of the Church, and I still believe that there was truth in the doctrines I followed; and then there happened to me a thing which now is clear enough, but which then appeared to me very strange.

I was at one time listening to the discourse of an unlettered muzhik, a pilgrim. He spoke of God, of faith, of life, and of salvation, and a knowledge of what faith was seemed open to me.

I went amongst the people, familiarizing myself with

their ideas of life and faith, and the truth became clearer and clearer to me. It was the same when I read the "Martyrology" and "Prologues"; they became my favorite books. With the exception of the miracles, and looking on these as fables to bring out forcibly the thought, the reading of these books revealed to me the meaning of life. There I found the lives of Macarius the Great; of Ioasaph the Prince (the story of Buddha); the discourses of St. John Chrysostom; the story of the traveler in the well; of the Monk who found gold; of Peter the Publican;—this is the history of the martyrs, of those who have all testified the same, that life does not end with death; here we have the story of unlettered foolish men, who knew nothing of the doctrines of the Church.

But no sooner did I mix with learned believers, or consult their books, than doubts, uneasiness, and irritation came over me once more, and I felt that the more I studied their discourses the more I wandered from the truth, the nearer I came to the precipice.

CHAPTER XV

How often have I envied muzhiks their inability to read and write, their lack of learning. The very doctrines of faith which to me were manifest nonsense contained for them nothing that was false; they were able to accept them and to believe in truth, the same truth in which I also believed; only to me, unhappy, it was clear that truth was connected with falsehood by the finest threads of difference, and that I could not receive it in such a form.

In this condition I lived for three years, and when I first, like a new convert, little by little drew nearer to truth, and, led by an instinct, groped my way to the light, these obstacles seemed to me less formidable. When I failed to understand anything, I said, "I am wrong, I am wicked." But the more I became imbued with the spirit of the truths which I studied, the more

surely I saw them to be the substratum of life, the greater and more formidable became the obstacles, the more clearly defined the line between what I did not understand; and because I was unable to understand, I could understand only through lying unto myself.

Notwithstanding all my doubts and sufferings, I still clung to Orthodoxy; but practical questions arose and had to be settled, and the decisions of these questions by the Church, contrary to the elementary principles of the faith by which I lived, compelled me finally to abandon all communion with it.

The questions were, in the first place, the relation of the Orthodox Church to other churches, to Catholicism and the so-called Raskolniks or Dissenters. The interest which I took in this great question of faith led me at this time to form acquaintance with the professors of different creeds, Catholics, Protestants, Old Believers, Molokans¹ and others, and among them I found many who sincerely believed and obeyed the highest moral standard. I desired to be a brother to these men, and what came of it? The doctrines which had seemed to promise me the union of all men in one faith and love, these doctrines, in the persons of their best representatives, told me that all these men were living in a lie; that what gives them strength to live is a temptation of the devil, that we alone possess the possibility of knowing truth.

And I saw that the members of the Orthodox Church consider all those who do not profess the same faith as themselves to be heretics, exactly as Catholics and others account our Orthodoxy to be heresy; I saw that Orthodoxy considers others who do not adopt the same outward symbols and the same formulas of faith as herself as her enemies, though she tries to conceal it; and it must be so, in the first place, because the assertion that you live a lie and I am in the truth is the hardest thing that one man can say to another; in the second place, because a man who loves his children and his brethren cannot but feel at enmity with those who

¹ "Milk-drinkers," who do not believe in fasting.

desire to convert his children and brethren to a false faith. Moreover, this enmity increases as men learn more of the particular doctrines which they adopt. Even I, who had believed faith was to be found in the union of love, was unwillingly forced to see that the doctrines of faith destroy the very thing which they should produce.

This snare is so evident, to men living like ourselves in countries where differing faiths are professed, and witnessing the contemptuous and self-confident exclusiveness with which the Catholic treats the Protestant and Orthodox, repaid by the scorn of the Orthodox for the Catholic and the Protestant, and that of the latter for both the others, while the same relation of enmity includes the Old Believers, the Revivalists, the Shakers, and all other creeds, that at first it perplexes us.

We say to ourselves:—

“No, it cannot be so simple as that, and yet these men have not seen that when two propositions contradict each other they cannot both have the one truth on which faith should rest. There was some cause for this, there was some explanation.”

I myself thought there was, and sought for it; and with this object in view I read everything I could get on the subject, and consulted with as many as I could, but the only explanation I obtained was that in accordance with which “Sumsky” hussars account their “Sumsky” regiment the first in the world, while the yellow Uhlans consider that the first regiment in the world is that of the yellow Uhlans.

Clergymen of all the different religions, the best representatives of them, without exception, all told me of their belief that they alone were right and all others wrong, and that all they could do for those who were in error was to pray for them. I went to archimandrites, bishops, priors, and ascetic monks, and asked them; but no one made the slightest attempt to explain this snare to me. Only one among them all explained everything for me, but his explanation was such that I asked nothing more of any one.

I said that, for every unbeliever who returns to belief (in which category I place the whole of the present young generation) the principal question is, Why is truth to be found in the Orthodox Church and not in the Lutheran or the Catholic Church? He is taught in his gymnasium, and he cannot but know what the peasant is ignorant of, that Protestants and Catholics equally affirm their own faith to be the only true one.

Historical proofs, twisted by each sect to serve their own purpose, are insufficient. Is it not possible, as I have already said, for a higher knowledge to issue from the disappearance of these differences, as they do already disappear for those who sincerely believe? Can we not go farther on the way on which we and the Old Believers start out together? They affirm that our way of signing the cross, of singing hallelujah, and of moving round the altar, is not the same as theirs. We say :—

“You believe in the Nicene Creed, in the seven sacraments, and we also believe. Keep to that, and for the rest do as you will.”

We shall then be united to them by this, that we both place the essential points of faith above the unessential. Again, can we not say to Catholics :—

“You believe in this and in that, in certain things which are essential, but in what concerns the dispute about the procession of the Trinity and the Pope, do as you please”?

Can we not say the same to the Protestant, and unite with him in what is really important?

My fellow-disputant agreed with me, but added that such concessions draw down the reproach that the clergy have receded from the faith of their forefathers and favor dissent, while the office of those in authority in the Church is to preserve the purity of the Russian Greek Orthodox faith as handed down from our ancestors.

Then I understood it all. I am in search of faith, the staff and strength of life, while these men seek the best means of fulfilling in the sight of men certain human obligations, and having to deal with human affairs, they fulfil them as ordinary men ever do. How

ever much they may talk of their pity for the errors of their brethren, of praying for them at the throne of the Most High, for the accomplishment of earthly affairs force is needed, and force always has been, is, and will be, applied.

If two religious sects each believe that truth resides in themselves, and that the faith of the other is a lie, they will preach their doctrines in the hope of converting their brethren to the truth, and, if false doctrines are taught to the inexperienced sons of the Church who still tread in the ways of truth, she cannot but burn the books and banish the man who seduces her sons. What can be done with the Sectary, who in his fiery enthusiasm for a faith which the Church pronounces false, seduces her sons? What can be done with him, but to cut off his head or imprison him? In the time of Alexis Mikharlovitch men were burnt at the stake; in other words, the severest punishment of the time was applied, and in our days also the severest punishment is applied; men are condemned to solitary confinement. When I looked around me at all that was done in the name of religion, I was horrified, and almost entirely withdrew from the Orthodox Church.

The second point which concerned the relations of the Church to the problems of life was her connection with war and executions. At this time Russia was engaged in war, and, in the name of Christian love, Russians were engaged in slaying their brethren. Not to think of this was impossible. Not to see that murder is an evil, contrary to the very first principles of every faith, was impossible. But at the same time in the churches men were praying for the success of our arms, and the teachers of religion were accepting these murders as acts which were the consequence of faith. Not only murder in actual warfare was approved, but, during the troubles which ensued, I saw members of the Church, her teachers, monks, and ascetics, approving of the murder of erring and helpless youths. I looked round on all that was done by men who professed to be Christians, and I was horrified.

CHAPTER XVI

I CEASED from this time to doubt, and became firmly convinced that not all was truth in the faith which I had joined. Formerly I should have said that all in this faith was false, but now it was impossible to say so.

The people as a whole had a knowledge of truth; this was incontestable, for otherwise they could not live. Moreover, this knowledge of truth was open to me; I was already living by it, and felt all its force, but in that same knowledge there was also error. Of that again I could not doubt. All, however, that had formerly repelled me now presented itself in a vivid light. Although I saw that there was less of what had repelled me as false among the people than among the representatives of the Church, I also saw that in the belief of the people what was false was mingled with what was true.

Whence, then, came this truth and this falsehood? Both the falsehood and the truth came to them from what is called the Church; both the falsehood and the truth are included in the traditions, the so-called sacred traditions and writings.

I was thus, whether I would or not, brought to the study and analysis of these writings and traditions, a study which up to that time I had feared, and I turned to the study of theology, which I had once thrown aside with such contempt as useless. Then theology had seemed to me but profitless trifling with nonsense; then I was surrounded by the phenomena of life, which seemed to me clear and full of meaning; now I should have been glad to throw off ideas unsuited to a healthy state of mind, but I could not.

On this doctrinal basis was founded, or at least with it was very intimately bound up, the only explanation of the meaning of the life I had so lately discovered. However strange it might seem to my old practised intellect, it was the only hope of salvation. To be understood, it must be cautiously and carefully examined,

even though the result might not be the certain knowledge of science, which, aware as I was of the special character of religious inquiry, I did not and could not seek to obtain.

I could not attempt to explain everything. I knew that the explanation of the whole, like the beginning of all things, was hidden in infinity. I wished to be brought to the inevitable limit where the incomprehensible begins; I wished that what remained uncomprehended should be so, not because the mental impulse to inquiry was not just and natural (all such impulses are just and without them I could understand nothing), but because I had learned the limits of my own mind. I wished to understand so that every unexplained proposition should appear to my reason necessarily unexplainable, and not an obligatory part of belief.

That the doctrines contained truth was unquestionable; but it was also unquestionable that they contained also falsehood, and I was bound to find the truth and the falsehood and separate the one from the other. I began to do this. What I found of false, what I found of true, and to what results I came, forms the following part of this work,¹ which, if it be thought worth while, and if it can be useful to any one, will probably be some day published.

1879.

The above was written by me three years ago.

The other day, on looking over this part again, on returning to the train of thought and to the feelings through which I had passed while writing it, I saw a dream.

This dream repeated for me in a condensed form all that I had lived through and described, and I therefore think that a description of it may, for those who have understood me, serve to render clearer, to refresh the remembrance of, and to collect into one whole, all that has been described at so much length in these pages. The dream was as follows.

¹ My Religion.

I see myself lying in bed, and I feel neither particularly well and comfortable, nor the contrary. I am lying on my back. I begin to think whether it is well for me to lie, and something makes me feel uncomfortable in the legs; if the bed be too short or ill-made, I know not, but something is not right. I move my legs about, and at the same time begin to think how and on what I am lying, a thing which previously had never troubled me. I examine my bed, and see that I am lying on a network of cords fashioned to the sides of the bedstead. My heels lie on one of these cords, my legs on another, and this is uncomfortable. I am somehow aware that the cords can be moved, and with my legs I push the cord away, and it seems to me that thus it will be easier.

But I had pushed the cord too far; I tried to catch it with my legs, but this movement causes another cord to slip from under me, and my legs hang down. I move my body to get right again, convinced that it will be easy, but this movement causes other cords to slip and change their places beneath me, and I perceive that my position is altogether worse; my whole body sinks and hangs, without my legs touching the ground. I hold myself up only by the upper part of the back, and I feel now not only discomfort, but horror. I now begin to ask myself what I had not thought of before. I ask myself where I am, and on what I am lying. I begin to look round, and first I look below, to the place toward which my body sank, and where I feel it must soon fall. I look below, and I cannot believe my eyes.

I am on a height far above that of the highest tower or mountain, a height beyond all my previous powers of conception. I cannot even make out whether I see anything or not below me, in the depths of that bottomless abyss over which I am hanging, and into which I feel drawn. My heart ceases to beat, and horror fills my mind. To look down is horrible. I feel that if I look down I shall slip from the last cord, and perish. I stop looking, but not to look is still worse, for then I think of what will at once happen to me when the last

cord breaks. I feel that I am losing, in my terror, the last remnant of my strength, and that my back is gradually sinking lower and lower. Another instant, and I shall fall.

Then all at once comes into my mind the thought that this cannot be true — it is a dream — I will awake.

I strive to wake myself, and cannot. "What can I do? what can I do?" I ask myself, and as I put the question I look above.

Above stretches another gulf. I look into this abyss of heaven, and try to forget the abyss below, and I do actually forget it. The infinite depth repels and horrifies me; the infinite height attracts and satisfies me. I still hang on the last cords which have not yet slipped from under me, over the abyss; I know that I am hanging thus, but I look only upwards, and my terror leaves me. As happens in dreams, I hear a voice saying, "Look well; it is there!" My eyes pierce farther and farther into the infinity above, and I feel that it calms me. I remember all that has happened, and I remember how it happened — how I moved my legs, how I was left hanging in air, how I was horrified, and how I was saved from my horror by looking above. I ask myself, "And now, am I not hanging still?" and I feel in all my limbs, without looking, the support by which I am held. I perceive that I no longer hang, and that I do not fall, but have a fast hold. I question myself how it is that I hold on. I touch myself, I look around, and I see that under the middle of my body there passes a stay, and on looking up I find that I am lying perfectly balanced, and that it was this stay alone that held me up before.

As happens in dreams, the mechanism by which I am supported appears perfectly natural to me, a thing to be easily understood, and not to be doubted, although this mechanism has no apparent sense when I am awake. In my sleep I was even astonished that I had not understood this before. At my bedside stands a pillar, the solidity of which is beyond doubt, though there is nothing for it to stand on. From this pillar runs a cord,

somehow cunningly and at the same time simply fixed, and if I lie across this cord and look upward, there cannot be even a question of my falling. All this was clear to me, and I was glad and easy in my mind. It seemed as if some one said to me, "See that you remember!"

And I awoke.

1882.

MY RELIGION

I HAVE lived in the world fifty-five years, and after the fourteen or fifteen years of my childhood, for thirty-five years of my life I was, in the proper acceptation of the word, a nihilist, — not a socialist and revolutionist, as is generally understood by that word, but a nihilist in the sense of one who believed in nothing. Five years ago I came to believe in the doctrine of Christ, and my whole life underwent a sudden transformation. What I had once wished for I wished for no longer. What had once appeared to me good now became evil, and the evil of the past I beheld as good.

My condition was like that of a man who goes forth on some errand, and suddenly on the way decides that the matter is of no importance, and returns home. What was at first on his right hand is now on his left, and what was at his left hand is now on his right; his former desire to be as far as possible from home has changed into a desire to be as near to it as possible. The direction of my life and my desires were completely changed; good and evil had changed places. All this resulted from the fact that I understood the doctrine of Christ in a different way from that in which I had understood it before.

I do not care to expound the doctrine of Christ; I wish only to tell how it was that I came to understand what in this doctrine is most simple, clear, evident, indisputable, and appeals most to all men, and how this understanding refreshed my soul and gave me happiness and peace.

I do not care to expound the doctrine of Christ; I should wish only one thing: to do away with all exposition.



ENTRANCE TO THE PARK OF VASNAYA POLYANA.

All the Christian Churches have always maintained that all men, however unequal in education and intellect, — the wise and the foolish, — are equal before God ; that divine truth is accessible to every one. Christ has even declared it to be the will of God that what is concealed from the wise shall be revealed to the simple.

Not every one is able to understand the mysteries of dogmatics, homiletics, patristics, liturgics, hermeneutics, apologetics ; but every one is able and ought to understand what Christ said to the millions of simple and ignorant people who have lived, and who are living to-day. Now, the things that Christ said to all these simple people who could not avail themselves of the comments of Paul, of Clement, of Chrysostom, and of others, are just what I did not understand, and which, now that I have come to understand them, I wish to make plain to all.

The thief on the cross believed in Christ, and was saved. Would it have been bad or injurious to any one if the thief had not died on the cross, but had descended from it, and told all men how he believed in Christ ?

Like the thief on the cross, I believed in the doctrine of Christ, and was saved. This is not a vain comparison, but a most accurate expression of my spiritual condition of horror and despair in the presence of life and death, in which I found myself formerly, and of that condition of happiness and peace in which I find myself now.

Like the thief, I knew that my past and present life was vile ; I saw that the majority of men about me lived in the same way. I knew, like the thief, that I was wretched and suffering, that all those about me suffered and were wretched ; and I saw before me no escape from this condition but in death. As the thief was nailed to his cross, so was I nailed to this life of suffering and evil by an incomprehensible power. And as the thief saw before him, after the senseless and evil sufferings of life, the horrible shadows of death, so did I behold the same prospect.

In all this I was absolutely like the thief. But there

was a difference in our conditions ; he was about to die, and I was still alive. The thief might believe that his salvation would be beyond the grave, while I had not only that before me, but also life this side the grave. I understood nothing of this life, it seemed to me frightful ; and then suddenly I heard the words of Christ, and understood them ; life and death ceased to seem evil, and instead of despair I tasted the joy and happiness that death could not take away.

Can it be harmful to any one, then, if I tell how this came about?

CHAPTER I

I HAVE written two large works explaining why I did not understand the doctrine of Christ, and why it became clear to me. "A Criticism of Dogmatic Theology" and a new translation of the four Gospels, followed by a Concordance. In these writings I seek methodically, step by step, to disentangle everything that conceals the truth from men ; I translate the four Gospels anew, verse by verse, and I bring them together in a new concordance.

This work has lasted more than five years. Each year, each month, I discover new explanations and corroborations of the fundamental idea ; I correct the errors which have crept in through haste and impulse, and I put the last touches to what I have already written. My life, of which only a small portion is before me, will doubtless end before I have finished my work ; but I am convinced that the work will be of great service ; so I shall do all that I can as long as I live.

Such was my prolonged outward work on theology and the Gospels, but my inward work, that which I propose to tell about in these pages, was of a very different nature. It was not a methodical exposition of theology and the text of the Gospels ; it was an instantaneous removal of all that had hidden the meaning of the teaching, and an instantaneous illumination with the light of Truth.

It was an experience similar to that which might happen to a man who, following an erroneous model, should

try to find the meaning of a heap of intermingled fragments, and should suddenly, by means of one large fragment, come to the conclusion that it was an entirely different statue from what he had supposed it to be; then beginning to fashion it anew, instead of the former incoherent mass of pieces, he would find, as he observed the outlines of each fragment, that all fitted well together, and formed one consistent whole, and he would be amazed at the confirmation of his thought

This is exactly what happened to me, and this is what I wish to relate. I wish to tell how I found the key to the true meaning of the doctrine of Christ, which revealed to me the truth clearly and convincingly, so that doubt was out of the question. The discovery came about in this way:—

Almost from the first period of my childhood, when I began to read the New Testament, I was touched and stirred most of all by that portion of the doctrine of Christ which inculcates love, humility, self-denial, and the duty of returning good for evil. This, to me, has always been the substance of Christianity; it was what I loved in it with all my heart, it was that in the name of which, after despair and disbelief, caused me to accept as true the meaning found in the Christian life by the working people, and in the name of which I submitted myself to those doctrines professed by these same working people—in other words, the Orthodox Church.

But in making my submission to the Church, I soon saw that I should not find in its creed the confirmation, the explanation of those principles of Christianity which seemed to me essential; I observed that the essence of Christianity, dear though it was to me, did not constitute the chief element in the doctrine of the Church. I observed that what seemed to me essential in Christ's teaching was not recognized by the Church as most important. Something else was regarded by the Church as most important. At first I did not appreciate the significance of this peculiarity of the Church teaching. "Well now,"—I thought—"the Church sees in Christianity, aside from its inner meaning of love, humility,

and self-denial, an outer, dogmatic meaning. This meaning is strange and even repulsive to me, but it is not in itself pernicious."

But the longer I continued to live in submission to the doctrine of the Church, the more clearly I saw this particular point was not so unimportant as it had seemed to me at first. I was driven from the Church by the strangeness of its dogmas, and the approval and the support which it gave to persecutions, to the death penalty, to wars, and by the intolerance common to all sects; but my faith was chiefly shattered by the indifference of the Church to what seemed to me essential in the teachings of Jesus, and by its avidity for what seemed to me not essential. I felt that something was wrong; but I could not discover what was wrong. I could not discover, because the doctrine of the Church did not deny, what seemed to me essential in the doctrine of Christ; it fully recognized it, yet recognized it in such a way that what was chief in the teaching of Christ was not given the first place. I could not blame the Church because she denied the essence of the doctrine of Jesus, but because she recognized it in a way which did not satisfy me. The Church did not give me what I expected from her.

I had passed from nihilism to the Church simply because I felt it to be impossible to live without religion, without a knowledge of good and evil beyond the animal instincts. I hoped to find this knowledge in Christianity; but Christianity, as it then presented itself to me, was only a very indeterminate spiritual tendency, from which it was impossible to deduce any clear and obligatory principles of life. For these rules I turned to the Church. The Church offered me certain rules, but they not only did not attract me to the Christian dispensation now so dear to me, but rather repelled me from it. I could not follow the Church. A life based on Christian truth was precious and indispensable to me, and the Church offered me rules completely at variance with the truth I loved. The rules of the Church touching belief in dogmas, the observance of the sacra-

ment, fasts, prayers, were not necessary to me, and did not seem to be based on Christian truth. Moreover, the rules of the Church weakened and sometimes destroyed the desire for Christian truth which alone gave meaning to my life.

I was troubled most by the fact that all human evil, the habit of judging private persons, of judging whole nations, of judging other religions, and the wars and massacres that were the consequence of such judgments, all went on with the approbation of the Church. Christ's teaching — judge not, be humble, forgive offenses, deny self, love, — this doctrine was extolled by the Church in words, but at the same time the Church approved what was incompatible with the doctrine. Was it possible that Christ's teaching admitted of such contradiction? I could not believe so.

Moreover, it always seemed to me astonishing that, as far as I knew the Gospels, the passages on which the Church based affirmation of its dogmas were those that were most obscure, while the passages from which came the fulfilment of its teaching were the most clear and precise. And yet the dogmas and the obligations depending on them were definitely formulated by the Church, while the recommendation to obey the moral law was put in the most obscure, vague, and mystical terms. Was this the intention of Jesus in teaching His doctrine? A resolution of my doubts I could find only in the Gospels, and I read them, and reread them.

Of everything in the Gospels, the Sermon on the Mount always had for me an exceptional importance. I now read it more frequently than ever. Nowhere else does Christ speak with so great solemnity as in these passages, nowhere else does He give so many clear and comprehensible moral laws, appealing to every man's heart; nowhere else does He address Himself to a larger multitude of the common people. If there are any clear and precise Christian principles, one ought to find them here. I therefore sought the solution of my doubts in these three¹ chapters of Matthew. I read the Sermon

¹ v., vi., and vii.

on the Mount many, many times, and I always experienced the same feelings of enthusiasm and emotion, as I read the verses that exhort the hearer to turn the other cheek, to give up his cloak, to be at peace with all men, to love his enemies, — but each time with the same disappointment. The divine words — addressed to all men — were not clear. They exhorted to an absolute renunciation of everything, such as entirely stifled life, as I understood it; to renounce everything, therefore, could not, it seemed to me, be an absolute condition of salvation. But the moment this ceased to be an absolute condition, clearness and precision were at an end.

I read not only the Sermon on the Mount; I read all the Gospels, and all the theological commentaries on them. I was not satisfied with the declarations of the theologians that the Sermon on the Mount was only an indication of the degree of perfection to which man should aspire; but that fallen man, weighed down by sin, could not reach such an ideal; and that the salvation of humanity was in faith and prayer and grace.

I could not admit the truth of these propositions, because it seemed to me strange that Christ, knowing beforehand that it was impossible for man, with his own powers, to carry his teaching into practice, should propound rules so clear and admirable, addressed to the understanding of every one. But as I read these maxims it always seemed to me that they applied directly to me, that their fulfilment was demanded of me. As I read these maxims I was filled with the joyous assurance that I might that very hour, that very moment, begin to practice them. I desired to do so, I tried to do so, but as soon as I began to enter upon the struggle I could not help remembering the teaching of the Church — *Man is weak, and to this he cannot attain* — and my strength failed. I was told, "You must believe and pray;" but I was conscious that I had small faith, and so I could not pray. I was told, "You must pray, and God will give you faith; this faith will inspire prayer, which in turn will invoke faith that will inspire more prayer, and so on, indefinitely."

But reason and experience alike convinced me that such methods were useless. It seemed to me that the only true way was for me to try to follow the teaching of Christ.

And so, after all this fruitless search, study of all that had been written for and against the divinity of this doctrine, after all this doubt and suffering, I remained alone with my heart and with the mysterious book before me. I could not give to it the meanings that others gave, neither could I discover what I sought nor could I get away from it. Only after I had gone through alike all the interpretations of the wise critics and all the interpretations of the wise theologians and had rejected them all according to the words of Jesus, "*Except ye....become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven*"¹—I suddenly understood what I had not understood before. I understood, not because I made any artificial combination of texts, or any profound and ingenious misinterpretations; on the contrary, I understood everything because I put all commentaries out of my mind. The passage that gave me the key to the whole was from the fifth chapter of Matthew, verses thirty-eight and thirty-nine:—

"It has been said unto you, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, That you resist not evil."

Suddenly, for the first time, I understood the exact and simple meaning of those words; I understood that Jesus said exactly what he said. Immediately—not that I saw anything new; only the veil that had hidden the truth from me fell away, and the truth was revealed in all its significance.

"It has been said unto you, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, That you resist not evil."

These words suddenly appeared to me absolutely new, as if I had never read them before. Always before, when I had read this passage, I had, singularly enough, allowed certain words to escape me, "*But I say unto*

¹ Matt. xviii. 3.

you, that you resist not evil." To me it had always been as if the words just quoted had never existed, or had never possessed a definite meaning.

Later on, as I talked with many Christians familiar with the Gospel, I noticed frequently the same blindness with regard to these words. No one remembered them, and often, in speaking of this passage, Christians took up the Gospel to see for themselves if the words were really there. Through a similar neglect of these words I had failed to understand the words that follow:—

"But whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also," etc.¹

Always these words had seemed to me to demand long-suffering and privation contrary to human nature. These words touched me; I felt that it would be noble to follow them, but I also felt that I should never have the strength to put them into practice, only to put them into practice so as to suffer. I said to myself, "If I turn the other cheek, I shall get another blow; if I give, all that I have will be taken away. Life would be an impossibility. Since life is given to me, why should I deprive myself of it? Christ cannot demand that." Thus I reasoned, persuaded that Christ in these words exalted suffering and deprivation, and in exalting them, made use of exaggerated terms lacking in clearness and precision; but when I understood the words "*Resist not evil*," it became clear to me that Jesus did not exaggerate, that he did not demand suffering for suffering, but that he said with great clearness and precision exactly what he wished to say.

He said "*Resist not evil*, and if you do so you will know beforehand that you may meet with those who, when they have struck you on one cheek and met with no resistance, will strike you on the other; who, having taken away your coat, will take away your cloak also; who, having profited by your labor, will force you to labor still more without reward. And yet, though all this should happen to you, '*Resist not evil*'; do good to them that injure you."

¹ Matt. v. 39, *et seq.*

When I understood these words as they were said, all that had been obscure became clear to me, and what had seemed exaggerated I saw to be perfectly reasonable. For the first time I saw that the center of gravity of the whole idea lay in the words "*Resist not evil*"; and that what followed was only a development of this command; I saw that Jesus did not exhort us to turn the other cheek and give up the cloak that we might endure suffering, but that his exhortation was, "*Resist not evil*," and that he afterward declared suffering to be the possible consequence of the practice of this maxim.

Exactly as a father who is sending his son on a far journey does not command him to pass his nights without shelter, to go without food, to expose himself to rain and cold when he says to him, "Go thy way, and tarry not, even though thou should'st be wet or cold," so Jesus does not say, "Turn the other cheek and suffer." He says, "*Resist not evil*"; no matter what happens, "*Resist not evil*."

These words, "*Resist not evil or the evil man*," understood in their direct significance, were to me truly the key that opened all the rest. And I began to be astonished that I could have miscomprehended words so clear and precise.

"It has been said unto you, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, That you resist not evil or the evil man."

Whatever injury the evil-disposed may inflict upon you, bear it, give all that you have, but resist not evil or the evil one. Could anything be more clear, more definite, more intelligible than that? I had only to grasp the simple and exact meaning of these words, just as they were spoken, when the whole teaching of Christ, not only as set forth in the Sermon on the Mount, but in the entire Gospels, became clear to me; what had seemed contradictory was now in harmony; above all, what had seemed superfluous was now indispensable. Each portion fell into harmonious unison and filled its proper part, like the fragments of a broken statue when put together as they should be. In the

Sermon on the Mount, as well as throughout the whole Gospel, I found everywhere affirmation of the same doctrine, "*Resist not evil.*"

In the Sermon on the Mount, as well as in all other places, Christ presents Himself to His disciples, in other words, to those that observe the rule of non-resistance to evil, as turning the other cheek, giving up their cloaks, persecuted, used despitefully, and in want. Elsewhere, many times Christ says that he who does not take up his cross, who does not renounce worldly advantage, he who is not ready to bear all the consequences of the commandment, "*Resist not evil,*" cannot become His disciple.

To His disciples Jesus says, Choose to be poor; be ready to bear persecution, suffering, and death, without resistance to evil.

He himself was ready to bear suffering and death rather than resist evil, and He reproved Peter for wishing to avenge Him, and He died forbidding His followers to resist, nor did He make any modification in His doctrine. All His early disciples observed this rule, and passed their lives in poverty and persecution, and never rendered evil for evil.

Christ must have said what He said. We may declare the universal practice of such a rule is very difficult; we may deny that he who follows it will find happiness; we may say with the unbelievers that it is stupid, that Christ was a dreamer, an idealist who propounded impracticable maxims which His disciples followed out of sheer stupidity; but it is impossible not to admit that Christ expressed in a manner at once clear and precise what He wished to say; that is, that according to His doctrine a man must not resist evil, and, consequently, that whoever adopts His doctrine cannot resist evil. And yet neither believers nor unbelievers will admit this simple and clear interpretation of Christ's words.

CHAPTER II

WHEN I understood that the words "*Resist not evil*," meant *resist not evil*, my whole former conception of Christ's teaching suddenly changed; and I was horrified, not that I had failed to understand it before, but that I had misunderstood it so strangely. I knew, as we all know, that the true significance of the Christian doctrine was comprised in the injunction to love one's neighbor. When we say, "*Turn the other cheek*," "*Love your enemies*," we express the very essence of Christianity. I knew all that from my childhood; but why had I failed to understand aright these simple words? Why had I always sought for some ulterior meaning? "*Resist not evil*" means never resist, never oppose violence; or, in other words, never do anything contrary to the law of love. If any one takes advantage of this disposition and affronts you, bear the affront, and do not, above all, have recourse to violence. Christ said this in words so clear and simple that it would be impossible to express the idea more clearly. How was it, then, that believing or trying to believe that He who said this was God, I still maintained that it is beyond my power to obey them? If my master says to me, "Go; cut some wood," and I reply, "I cannot do this: it is beyond my strength," I say one of two things: either I do not believe what my master says, or I do not wish to do what my master commands. Should I, without having made the slightest effort of my own to obey, then say of God's commandment that I could not obey it without the aid of a supernatural power? Should I say this of a commandment which He gave us to obey, concerning which He said that whoever obeyed it and taught it should be called great, concerning which He declared that only those that obey it shall have life, which He Himself obeyed, and which He expressed so clearly and simply that it leaves no room for doubt as to its meaning!

God descended to earth to save mankind; salva-

tion was secured by the second person of the Trinity, God-the-Son, who suffered for men, thereby redeeming them from sin, and gave them the Church as the shrine for the transmission of grace to all believers; but aside from this, Person God-the-Son gave to men a doctrine and the example of a life for their salvation. How, then, could I say that the rules of life formulated by Him so clearly and simply for every one — were so difficult to obey that it was impossible to obey them without supernatural aid? He not only did not say, but He distinctly declared, that those that did not obey could not enter into the kingdom of God. Nowhere did He say that obedience would be difficult; on the contrary, He said, "*My yoke is easy and my burden is light.*"¹ And John, His evangelist, says, "*His commandments are not grievous.*"² Since God laid down His command and defined so accurately the conditions of its fulfilment and obedience to it to be easy, and Himself practised it in human form, as did also His disciples, how could I say it was hard or impossible to obey without supernatural aid?

If a man should bend all the energies of his mind to overthrow any law, what could this man say of greater force than that the law was essentially impracticable, and that the maker of the law knew that it was impracticable, and that to obey it required supernatural aid.

Yet that is exactly what I had been thinking of the command, "*Resist not evil.*" I endeavored to find out how and when I got the strange idea that Christ's law was divine, but could not be obeyed; and as I reviewed my past history, I perceived that the idea had not been communicated to me in all its crudeness, — it would then have been revolting to me, — but that I had drunk it in with my mother's milk insensibly from earliest childhood, and all my after life had only confirmed me in this strange error.

From my childhood I had been taught that Christ was God, and that His doctrine was divine, but at the same

¹ Matt. xi. 30.

² 1 John v. 3.

time, I was taught to respect the institutions that protected me from violence and evil, and to regard them as sacred. I was taught to resist evil; I was inspired with the idea that it was humiliating to submit to evil, and that resistance to it was praiseworthy. I was taught to judge, and to inflict punishment. Then I was taught the soldier's trade, that is, to resist evil by homicide; the army to which I belonged was called "The Christophile Army,"¹ and it was sent forth with a Christian benediction. Moreover, from infancy to manhood I learned to venerate what was in direct contradiction to Christ's law, — to meet an aggressor with his own weapons, to avenge myself by violence for all offenses against my person, my family, or my people. Not only was I not blamed for this, but I was led to regard it as fine, and not contrary to Christ's law.

All that surrounded me, my comfort, my personal security, and that of my family and my property, depended then on a law which Christ repudiated, — the law of "a tooth for a tooth."

My Church instructors taught me that Christ's teaching was divine, but, because of human weakness, impossible of practice, and that the grace of Christ alone could aid us to follow its precepts. My secular teachers and the whole organization of life agreed in calling Christ's teaching impracticable and visionary, and by words and deeds taught what was opposed to it. I was so thoroughly possessed with this idea of the impracticability of the divine doctrine, it had gradually become such a habit with me, the idea conformed so well with my desires, that I had never noticed the contradiction in which I had become involved. I did not see how impossible it was to confess Christ as God, the basis of whose teaching is the law of the non-resistance of evil, and at the same time deliberately to assist in the organization of property, of tribunals, of the government, of the army; to arrange my life in a manner entirely contrary to the doctrine of Jesus, and at the same time to pray to this same Christ to help us to obey His com-

¹ *Khristoliubivoye voïnstvo.*

mands, to forgive our sins, and to aid us that we resist not evil. It did not enter my head, clear as it is to me now, how much more simple it would be to arrange and organize life conformably to Christ's law, and then to pray for tribunals, and massacres, and wars, if these things are so indispensable to our happiness.

Thus I came to understand how my error arose. It arose from my confessing Christ in words and rejecting Him in reality.

The position concerning the resistance of evil is a position which unites the whole teaching into one whole, nor only because it is not a mere verbal affirmation; it is a rule the practice of which is obligatory, since it is a law.

It is exactly like a key which opens everything, but only when the key is thrust into the lock. When we regard it as a verbal affirmation impossible of performance without supernatural aid, it amounts to the nullification of the entire doctrine. Why should not a doctrine seem impracticable, when we have suppressed its fundamental proposition? Unbelievers look on it as totally absurd—they cannot look on it in any other way. To set up an engine, to heat the boiler, to start it, but not to attach the belt—that is what is done with Christ's teaching when it is taught that one may be a Christian without observing the commandment, "*Resist not evil.*"

Not long ago I was reading the fifth chapter of Matthew with a Hebrew rabbi. At nearly every verse the rabbi said, "That is in the Bible," or "That is in the Talmud," and he showed me in the Bible and in the Talmud sentences very like the declarations of the Sermon on the Mount. But when we reached the verse about non-resistance of evil the rabbi did not say, "This also is in the Talmud," but he asked me, with a cynical smile, "Do the Christians obey this command? Do they turn the other cheek?"

I had nothing to say in reply, especially as at that particular time Christians not only were not turning the other cheek, but were smiting the Jews on both cheeks. But I was interested to know if there were anything

similar in the Bible or in the Talmud, and I asked him about it.

"No," he replied, "there is nothing like it; but tell me, do the Christians obey this law?"

By this question he told me that the presence in the Christian doctrine of a commandment which no one observed, and which Christians themselves regarded as impracticable, is simply an avowal of the foolishness and nullity of that law. I could say nothing in reply to the rabbi.

Now that I understand the exact meaning of the doctrine, I see clearly the strangely contradictory position in which I was placed. Having recognized Christ as God, and His doctrine as divine, and having at the same time organized my life wholly contrary to that doctrine, what remained for me but to regard the doctrine as impracticable? In words I had recognized Christ's teaching as sacred; in actions I had professed a doctrine not at all Christian, and I had recognized and revered the unchristian customs which hampered my life on every side.

The Old Testament, throughout, teaches that misfortunes came upon the people of Judæa because they believed in false gods, and not in the true God. Samuel, in the eighth and twelfth chapters of the first book, accuses the people of adding to their other apostasies a new one: in place of God, who was their King, they had raised up a man for a king, who, they thought, would deliver them. "*Turn not aside after tohu, after vain things,*" Samuel says to the people; "*turn not aside after vain things, which cannot profit nor deliver; for they are tohu, are vain.*" "*Fear Jehovah and serve him. But if ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your king.*"¹

And so with me, faith in *tohu*, in vain things, in empty idols, had concealed the truth from me. Across the path which led to the truth, *tohu*, the idol of vain things, rose before me, cutting off the light, and I had not the strength to beat it down.

¹ 1 Sam. xii. 21, 24, 25.

One day I was walking (in Moscow) in the Borovitskiya Gates. At the gates an old lame beggar was sitting, with a dirty cloth wrapped about his ears. I was just taking out my purse to give him something. At the same moment down from the Kremlin ran a gallant ruddy-faced young soldier, a grenadier in the crown tulup. The beggar, on perceiving the soldier, arose in fear, and ran with all his might toward the Alexandrovsky Park. The grenadier chased him for a time, but not overtaking him, stopped and began to curse the poor wretch because he had established himself under the gateway contrary to regulations. I waited for the soldier. When he approached me, I asked him if he knew how to read.

"Yes; why do you ask?"

"Have you read the New Testament?"

"I have."

"And do you remember the words, 'If thine enemy hunger, feed him'....?"

I repeated the passage. He remembered it, and heard me to the end, and I saw that he was uneasy. Two passers-by stopped and listened. The grenadier seemed to be troubled that he should be condemned for doing his duty in driving persons away as he was ordered to drive them away. He was confused, and evidently sought for an excuse. Suddenly a light flashed in his intelligent dark eyes; he looked at me over his shoulder, as if he were about to move away.

"And have you read the military regulation?" he asked.

I said that I had not read it.

"Then don't speak to me," said the grenadier, with a triumphant wag of the head, and buttoning up his tulup he marched gallantly away to his post.

He was the only man that I ever met who had solved, with an inflexible logic, the question which eternally confronted me in social relations, and which rises continually before every man who calls himself a Christian.

CHAPTER III

WE are wrong when we say that the Christian doctrine is concerned only with the salvation of the individual, and has nothing to do with questions of State. Such an assertion is simply a bold and proofless affirmation of a most manifest untruth, which, when we examine it seriously, falls of itself to the ground. It is well, I said to myself; I will not resist evil; I will turn the other cheek in private life; but if the enemy comes, or here is an oppressed nation, and I am called upon to do my part in the struggle against evil men, to go forth and kill them, I must decide the question, to serve God or *tohu*, to go to war or not to go. I am a peasant; I am appointed starshina of a village, a judge, a juryman; I am obliged to take the oath of office, to judge, to condemn. What ought I to do? Again I must choose between God's law and the human law. I am a monk, I live in a monastery; the neighboring peasants trespass on our pasturage, and I am appointed to take part in the struggle with the evil doers, to plead for justice against the muzhiks. Again I must choose. No man can escape the decision of this question.

I do not speak of those, the largest part of whose activity is spent in resisting evil: military men, judges, governors. No one is so obscure as not to be obliged to choose between God's service, the fulfilment of His commandments, and the service of *tohu*, in his relation to the State. My personal existence is entangled with that of the State, but the State exacts from me an unchristian activity directly contrary to Christ's commands. Now, with general military conscription and the part that every man, in his quality as juror, must take in judicial affairs, this dilemma arises before every one with remarkable definiteness. Every man is forced to take up murderous weapons — the gun, the sword; and even if he does not get as far as murder, his carbine must be loaded, and his sword keen of edge; that is, he must be ready for murder. Every citizen is forced into the ser-

vice of the courts to take part in meting out judgment and sentence ; that is, to deny Christ's command regarding non-resistance of evil, in acts as well as in words.

Mankind to-day faces the grenadier's problem : the gospel or military regulations, divine law or human law, exactly as Samuel faced it. Christ Himself faced it, and so did His disciples ; and those that would be Christians now face it ; and I also faced it.

Christ's law, with its doctrine of love, humility, and self-denial, had always long before touched my heart and attracted me to it. But everywhere, in history, in the events that were going on about me, in my individual life, I saw a contrary law revolting to my heart, my conscience, and my reason, and encouraging to my animal instincts. I felt that if I adopted Christ's law, I should be alone ; I might be unhappy ; I was likely to be persecuted and afflicted as Christ had said. But if I adopted the human law, every one would approve ; I should be in peace and safety, with all the capabilities of intellect at my command to put my conscience at ease. As Christ said, I should laugh and be glad. I felt this, and so I did not analyze the meaning of Christ's law, but sought to understand it in such a way that it might not interfere with my life as an animal. But it was impossible to understand it in that way, and so I did not understand it at all.

Through this lack of understanding, I reached a degree of blindness which now astounds me. As an instance in point, I will adduce my former understanding of these words, —

*"Judge not, that ye be not judged."*¹

*"Judge not, and ye shall not be judged ; condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned."*²

The courts in which I served, and which insured the safety of my property and my person, seemed to be institutions so indubitably sacred and so entirely in accord with the divine law, it had never entered into my head that the words I have quoted could have any other meaning than an injunction not to speak ill of one's neighbor.

¹ Matt. vii. 1.

² Luke vi. 37.

It never entered into my head that Christ spoke in these words of the court of the zemstvo, of the criminal tribunal, of the circuit court, and all the senates and departments. Only when I understood the true meaning of the words, "*Resist not evil*," did the question arise as to Christ's relation to all these courts and departments; and when I understood that Christ would renounce them, I asked myself, "Is not this the real meaning: Not only do not judge your neighbor, do not speak ill of him; but do not judge him in the courts, do not judge him in any of the tribunals that you have instituted?"

Now in Luke (vi. 37-49) these words follow immediately the doctrine that exhorts us to resist not evil and to render for evil, good. And after the injunction, "*Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful*," it says, "*Judge not, and ye shall not be judged; condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned*."

"*Judge not*;" I asked myself, "does not this mean, Institute no tribunals for the judgment of your neighbor"? I had only to put this question boldly, when heart and reason united in an affirmative reply.

I know how surprising at first such an understanding of these words must be. It also surprised me. In order to show how far I was before from the true interpretation, I shall confess a shameful pleasantry. Even after I had become a believer, and was reading the New Testament as a divine book, on meeting such of my friends as were judges or attorneys, I was in the habit of saying, "And you still judge, although it is said, '*Judge not, and ye shall not be judged*'?" I was so sure that these words could have no other meaning than a condemnation of evil speaking that I did not comprehend the horrible blasphemy I thus committed. I was so thoroughly convinced that these words did not mean what they did mean, that I quoted them in their true sense in the form of a pleasantry.

I shall relate in detail how it was that all doubt with regard to the true meaning of these words was effaced from my mind, and how I saw their purport to be that Christ denounced the institution of all human tribunals,

of whatever sort ; that he meant to say so, and could not have expressed himself otherwise.

When I understood the command, "*Resist not evil*," in its proper sense, the first thing that occurred to me was that human tribunals, instead of conforming to this law, were directly opposed to it, and indeed to the entire doctrine ; and therefore that if Christ had thought of tribunals at all, He would have condemned them.

Christ said, "*Resist not evil*." The aim of tribunals is to resist evil. Christ exhorted us to *return good for evil* ; tribunals return evil for evil. Christ said, Make no distinction between the good and the evil ; tribunals do nothing else. Christ said, *Forgive ; forgive not once or seven times*, but without limit ; *love your enemies, do good to them that hate you*, — but tribunals do not forgive, they punish ; they return not good but evil to those whom they regard as the enemies of society. It would seem, then, that Christ denounced judicial institutions.

But perhaps, said I to myself, Christ never had anything to do with courts of justice, and so did not think of them. But I saw that such a theory was not tenable. Jesus, from His childhood to His death, was concerned with the tribunals of Herod, of the Sanhedrim, and of the High Priests. I saw that Jesus must really have spoken many times of the courts of justice as of an evil. He told His disciples that they would be dragged before the judges, and He Himself told them how to behave in court. He said of Himself that He should be condemned by a tribunal, and He showed what the attitude toward judges ought to be. Christ then must have had in mind the judicial institutions that condemned Him and His disciples ; that have condemned and continue to condemn millions of men.

Christ saw the wrong, and pointed it out. When the sentence against the woman taken in adultery was about to be carried into execution, He absolutely repudiated the judgment, and demonstrated that man could not be the judge, since man himself was guilty. And this idea He propounded many times, as where it is declared that the man with a beam in his eye cannot see the mote in

another's eye, or that the blind cannot lead the blind. He even pointed out the consequences of such misconceptions, — the disciple would be the same as his Master.

But, perhaps, after having said this in regard to the judgment of the woman taken in adultery, and illustrated the general weakness of humanity by the parable of the beam; perhaps, after all, Christ would admit of an appeal to the justice of men where it was necessary for protection against evil men; but I soon saw that this is inadmissible. In the Sermon on the Mount, he says, addressing the multitude, —

*"And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also."*¹

Of course He forbids all men to go to law.

Once more, perhaps, Christ spoke only of the personal bearing which a man should have when brought before judicial institutions, and did not condemn justice, but admitted the necessity in a Christian society of individuals who judge others in properly constituted forms. But I saw that this view also is inadmissible. In the Lord's prayer all men, without exception, are commanded to forgive others, that their own trespasses may be forgiven. This thought Christ often expresses. He who brings his gift to the altar with prayer must first forgive all men. How, then, can a man judge and condemn when his religion commands him to forgive all trespasses without limit? So I saw that according to Christ's teaching no Christian judge could pass sentence of condemnation.

But might not the relation between the words "*Judge not, and ye shall not be judged*" and the preceding or subsequent passages permit us to conclude that Christ, in saying, "*Judge not*," had no reference to human tribunals? No; this could not be so: on the contrary, it is clear from the relation of the phrases that in saying "*Judge not*," Christ did actually speak of judicial institutions. According to Matthew and Luke, before saying "*Judge not, condemn not*," He said, "*Resist not evil; endure evil; do good to all men.*" And prior to this, as

¹ Matt, v. 40.

Matthew tells us, He repeated the ancient criminal law of the Jews, "*An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.*" Then, after this reference to the old criminal law, He added, "*But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil ;*" and, after that, "*Judge not.*" Jesus did, then, refer directly to human criminal law, and repudiated it in the words, "*Judge not.*"

Moreover, according to Luke, He not only said, "*Judge not,*" but also, "*Condemn not.*" He had some purpose in adding this almost synonymous word ; the addition of this word can have only one object : it shows clearly what meaning should be attributed to the other.

If He had wished to say "Judge not your neighbor," He would have said "neighbor"; but He added the words which are translated "*Condemn not,*" and then completed the sentence, "*And ye shall not be condemned ; forgive, and ye shall be forgiven.*"

But some may still insist that Christ, in expressing Himself in this way, did not refer at all to the tribunals, and that I have read my own thoughts into words of His that have a different significance. I will ask how Christ's first disciples, the apostles, regarded courts of justice, — whether they recognized and approved of them. The apostle James says :—¹

"Speak not evil one of another, brethren. He that speaketh evil of his brother, and judgeth his brother, speaketh evil of the law, and judgeth the law : but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge. There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy : who art thou that judgest another ?"

The word translated "speak evil" is the verb *καταλαλέω*. It may be seen, without consulting a lexicon, that this word ought to mean "to speak against, to accuse"; and this is its true meaning, as any one may find out for himself by opening a lexicon. In the translation we read, "*He that speaketh evil of his brother, speaketh evil of the law.*" Why so? is the question that involuntarily arises. I may speak evil of my brother, but I do not thereby speak evil of the law ; but if I *accuse*

¹ James iv. 11, 12.

my brother, if I bring him to court, it is plain that I thereby accuse Christ's law ; in other words, I consider Christ's law inadequate : I accuse and judge the law. It is clear, then, that I do not practise His law, but that I make myself a judge of the law. The judge, says Christ, is he who can save. How then shall I, who cannot save, become a judge and punish ?

The entire passage refers to human justice, and repudiates it. The whole epistle is permeated with the same idea. In the second chapter we read :—

“(1) *My brethren, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ the glorified should be without respect of persons.*

“(2) *For if there come into your synagogue a man with a gold ring, in rich apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment* (3) *and you have respect to him that wears the rich apparel and you say to him : ‘It is seemly for you to sit here,’ and you say to the poor man : ‘You stand there or sit here under my foot-stool’ ;* (4) *are you not then partial among yourselves, and are you not become judges with evil thoughts ?*

“(5) *Hearken, my beloved brethren, has not God chosen the poor of this world to be rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which He promised to those that love Him ?*

(6) *But you despised the poor ! Do not the rich oppress you, and do they not draw you before the judgment-seat ?*

(7) *Do they not dishonor the worthy name by which you are called ?*

“(8) *If you fulfil the royal law according to the Scripture, — Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,¹ — you do well.*

(9) *But if you have respect to persons, you commit sin, and are convicted as transgressors before the law.*

(10) *For whosoever shall keep the whole law and offend in one point, he is guilty in all.*

(11) *For he that said, ‘Do not commit adultery’ said also ‘Do not kill.’ Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.²*

“(12) *So speak and so do as men that shall be judged by the law of liberty.*

“(13) *For he shall have judgment without mercy, that*

¹ Lev. xix. 18.

² Deut. xxii. 22 ; Lev. xviii. 17–25.

*hath shewed no mercy; and mercy shall triumph over judgment."*¹

(The last phrase, "*mercy shall triumph over judgment*," has been frequently translated "*mercy is exalted above judgment*," and cited thus in the sense that there can be such a thing as Christian judgment, but that it ought to be merciful.)

James exhorts his brethren to have no respect of persons. If you διασκριβίτε — have respect of the condition of persons, — you discriminate; you are like the untrustworthy judges of the tribunals. You regard the beggar as worse, while on the contrary the rich man is worse. He oppresses you and draws you before the judgment-seats. If you live according to the law of love for your neighbor, according to the law of mercy (which James calls "*the law of liberty*," to distinguish it from all others) — if you live according to this law, it is well. But if you have respect of persons, if you make discriminations among men, you transgress the law of mercy. Then, doubtless thinking of the case of the woman taken in adultery, who was brought before Jesus, about to be stoned to death according to the law, or thinking of the crime of adultery in general, James says that he who inflicts death on the adulterous woman would himself be guilty of murder, and thereby transgress the eternal law; for the eternal law forbids both adultery and murder. He says:—

*"So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty. For he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath shewed no mercy; and therefore mercy blots out judgment."*²

Could the idea be expressed in terms more clear and precise? All discrimination among men is forbidden, as well as any judgment that shall classify persons as good or bad; human judgment is declared to be inevitably defective, and such judgment is denounced as criminal when it condemns for crime; judgment is blotted out by the law of God, the law of mercy.

¹ Jas. ii. 13. (Count Tolstol's rendering.)

² Jas. ii. 12, 13.

I open the epistles of the Apostle Paul, who had been a victim of tribunals, and in the first chapter of Romans I read the admonitions of the apostle for the vices and errors of those to whom his words are addressed; among other matters he speaks of courts of justice:—

*“Who, knowing the righteous judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.”*¹

“Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest another: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest another doest the same things.

“But we know that the judgment of God against those that do such things is righteous.

“And thinkest thou, O man, to escape the judgment of God, when thou judgest those that do such things, and yet doest them thyself?

*“Or despisest thou the riches of His goodness and forbearance and longsuffering: not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?”*²

The Apostle Paul says that they who know the righteous judgment of God, themselves act unjustly and teach others to do the same, and therefore it is impossible to absolve a man who judges.

Such an opinion regarding tribunals I find in the epistles of the apostles, and we know that human justice was among the trials and sufferings that they endured with resignation to the will of God. When we think of the situation of the early Christians, in the midst of heathen, we can easily understand that it could never have occurred to the Christians persecuted by human tribunals to defend human tribunals. Only on occasion could they touch upon this evil, denying that on which it is based, and thus they did. The apostles speak of this evil.

I consulted with the early Fathers of the Church, and found that they all invariably had distinct teaching which distinguishes them from all others — in this re

¹ Rom. i. 32.

² Rom. ii. 1-4.

spect, that they laid no obligation on any one, they did not judge¹ or condemn any one, and that they endured the tortures inflicted by human justice. The martyrs, by their acts, declared themselves to be of the same mind. I saw that Christianity before Constantine regarded tribunals only as an evil which was to be endured with patience; but it never could have occurred to any early Christian that a Christian could take part in the administration of the courts of justice.

I saw that Christ's words, "*Judge not, condemn not*," were understood by His first disciples exactly as I understood them now, in their direct and literal meaning: judge not in courts of justice; take no part in them.

All this seemed absolutely to corroborate my conviction that the words, "*Judge not, condemn not*," referred to the justice of tribunals. Yet the meaning, "Speak not evil of your neighbor," is so firmly established, and courts of justice flaunt their decrees with so much assurance and audacity in all Christian countries, with the support even of the Church, that for a long time still I doubted the correctness of my interpretation.

"If men have understood the words in this way," I said to myself, "and have instituted Christian tribunals, they must certainly have some reason for so doing; there must be a good reason for regarding these words as a denunciation of evil speaking, and there must be a basis of some sort for the institution of Christian tribunals."

I turned to the Church commentaries. In all, from the fifth century onward, I found the invariable interpretation to be, "Accuse not your neighbor;" that is, avoid evil speaking. As the words came to be understood exclusively in this sense, a difficulty arose, — How to refrain from judgment? It is impossible not to condemn evil; and so all the commentators discussed the question, What is blamable, and what is not blamable? Some, such as Chrysostom and Theophylact, said that, as far as servants of the Church were concerned,

¹ Athenagoras, Origen.

the phrase could not be construed as a prohibition of judgment, since the apostles themselves judged men. Others said that Christ doubtless referred to the Jews, who accused their neighbors of shortcomings, and were themselves guilty of great sins.

Nowhere a word about human institutions, about tribunals, to show how they were affected by the warning, "*Judge not.*" Did Jesus sanction courts of justice, or did he not?

To this natural question I found no reply — as if it was evident that from the moment a Christian took his seat on the judge's bench he might not only judge his neighbor, but condemn him to death.

I turned to other writers, Greek, Catholic, Protestant, — to the Tübingen school, to the historical school. All, even the most liberal commentators, interpreted the words in question as an injunction against evil speaking.

But why, contrary to the spirit of the whole doctrine of Christ, are these words interpreted in such a narrow way as to exclude courts of justice from the injunction, "*Judge not*"? Why is it supposed that Christ, in forbidding as an offense the judgment of a neighbor which may involuntarily slip from the tongue, did not forbid, did not even consider, the more deliberate judgment that results in punishment inflicted upon the condemned? To this there is no response; not even an allusion to the least possibility that the words "to judge" could be used as referring to a court of justice, to the tribunals from whose punishments millions have suffered.

Moreover, when the words, "*Judge not, condemn not,*" are under discussion, the cruelty of judging in courts of justice is passed over in silence, or else commended. The commentators and theologians all declare that in Christian countries tribunals are necessary, and are not contrary to the law of Christ.

Realizing this, I began to doubt the sincerity of the commentators, and I did what I should have done in the first place; I turned to the translation of the words rendered "to judge" and "to condemn." In the original these words are κρίνω and καταδικάζω. The defective

translation in the Epistle of James of the word *καταλαλέω* which is rendered "to speak evil," strengthened my doubts as to the correct translation of the others. When I looked through different versions of the Gospels, I found *καταδικάζω* rendered in the Vulgate by *condemnare*, "to condemn"; in the French it is the same; in the Slavonian the rendering is *asuzhdaïte*, "condemn." Luther has *verdammen*, "to curse."

The divergency of these renderings increased my doubts, and I propounded to myself this question: What is and what must be the meaning of the Greek word *κρίνω*, as used by the two evangelists, and of *καταδικάζω*, as used by Luke, who, scholars tell us, wrote very correct Greek.

How would these words be translated by a man who knew nothing of the evangelical creed and its commentators, and who had before him only this sentence?

I consulted the general lexicon, and found that the word *κρίνω* has several different meanings, the one most used being "to condemn in a court of justice," and even "to condemn to death," but in no instance does it signify "to speak evil." I consulted a lexicon of New Testament Greek, and found that it was often used in the sense "to condemn in a court of justice," sometimes in the sense "to choose," never as meaning "to speak evil." And so I inferred that the word *κρίνω* might be translated in different ways, but that the rendering "to speak evil" was the most forced and far-fetched.

I looked for the word *καταδικάζω*, which follows *κρίνω*, evidently to define more closely the sense in which the first word is understood by the writer. I looked for *καταδικάζω* in the general lexicon, and found that it never had any other signification than "to condemn in judgment," or "to judge worthy of death." I examined the contents and found that the word was used four times in the New Testament, each time in the sense "to condemn under sentence, to judge worthy of death." In James (v. 6) we read, "*Ye have condemned and killed the just.*" The word rendered "condemned" is this same *καταδικάζω*, and is used with reference to Christ, who

was judged. The word is never used in any other sense in the New Testament or in any other writing in the Greek language.

What, then, are we to say to all this? To what degree is my conclusion lame? Are not all of us who live in our circle, whenever we consider the fate of humanity, filled with horror at the sufferings and the evil inflicted on mankind by the enforcement of criminal codes, — a scourge to those who condemn as well as to the condemned, — from the slaughters of Genghis Khan to those of the French Revolution and the executions of our own times? He would indeed be without compassion who could refrain from feeling horror and repulsion, not only at the sight of human beings thus treated by their kind, but at the simple recital of death inflicted by the knout, the guillotine, or the gibbet.

The Gospel, every word of which we regard as sacred, declares distinctly and without equivocation: "You have a criminal law, a tooth for a tooth; but I give you a new law, That you resist not evil. Obey this law; render not evil for evil, but do good to every one, forgive every one, under all circumstances."

Further on comes the injunction, "*Judge not*"; and that these words might not be misunderstood, Christ added, "*Condemn not*; condemn not to punishment."

My heart said clearly, distinctly, "Punish not with death." "Punish not with death," said Science; "the more you kill, the more evil increases." Reason said, "Punish not with death; evil cannot suppress evil." The Word of God, in which I believed, said the same thing. And when, in reading the doctrine, I came to the words, "*Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned; forgive, and ye shall be forgiven*," I confessed that this was God's Word, and I declared that it meant that I was not to indulge in gossip and evil speaking, and yet I continued to regard tribunals as a Christian institution, and myself as a Christian judge!

I was overwhelmed with horror at the grossness of the error into which I had fallen.

CHAPTER IV

I NOW understood what Christ said when he said: "*Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil, but endure it.*"

Christ says: "You have thought that you were acting in a reasonable manner in defending yourself by violence against evil, in tearing out an eye for an eye, by establishing criminal tribunals, guardians of the peace, armies; by resisting your enemies; but I say unto you: Do no violence; have no share in violence; do harm to no one, not even to those that you consider your enemies."

I understood now that on the ground Christ took with regard to the non-resistance of evil, He not only told us what would result from the observance of this rule, but established a new basis for society conformable to His doctrine, and opposed to the social basis established by the law of Moses, by Roman law, and by the different codes in force to-day. He formulated a new law, the effect of which would be to deliver humanity from the evil which it has brought on itself.

He said: "You believe that your laws correct evil; as a matter of fact, they only increase it. There is only one way to suppress evil, and that is to return good for evil, without distinction. For thousands of years you have tried that method; now try mine, try the reverse."

A strange fact: in these later days, I have often talked with different persons about this commandment of Christ, "*Resist not evil*," and rarely have I found any one to agree with me! Two classes of men would never, even in principle, admit the literal interpretation of this law, always hotly defended the justice of resisting evil. These men were at two opposite poles, — they were the conservative Christian patriots who called their Church the true one, and the atheistic revolutionists.

Neither of these two classes is willing to renounce the right to resist by violence what they regard as evil.

And the wisest and most intelligent among them will never acknowledge the simple and evident truth, that if we once admit the right of any man to resist by violence what he regards as evil, every other man has equally the right to resist by violence what he regards as evil.

Not long ago I had in my hands an interesting correspondence between an orthodox Slavyanophile and a Christian revolutionist. The one advocated the violence of war in the name of the oppressed Slav brethren; the other, the violence of revolution in the name of our brethren, the oppressed Russian peasantry. Both invoked violence, and both rested on the doctrine of Christ.

Christ's doctrine is understood in a hundred different ways, but never in the simple and direct way which harmonizes with the inevitable meaning of His words.

We have arranged our entire social fabric on the very principles that Jesus repudiated; we do not wish to understand His doctrine in its simple and direct acceptance, and yet we assure ourselves and others, either that we follow His doctrine, or else that His doctrine is not expedient for us.

So-called believers believe that Christ-God, the second person of the Trinity, descended upon earth to teach men by His example how to live; they go through the most elaborate ceremonies for the consummation of the sacraments, the building of churches, the sending out of missionaries, the establishment of priesthoods, for parochial administration, for the performance of rituals; but they forget one little detail, — to do what He said.

Unbelievers endeavor in every possible way to organize their existence independent of the Christ's law, having decided that this law is not expedient for them. But to endeavor to put His teachings in practice, this no one wishes to do; and moreover, without any attempt to put them in practice, both believers and unbelievers have decided in advance that it is impossible.

He said, simply and clearly, this law of resistance to evil by violence, which you have made the basis of your life, is false and wrong; and He gave another basis, that

of non-resistance to evil, a law which, according to His doctrine, would deliver man from evil. He says: —

“You believe that your laws, which resort to violence, correct evil; they only augment it. For thousands of years you have tried to destroy evil by evil, and you have not destroyed it; you have only augmented it. Do as I command you, as I do, and you will know that this is true.”

Not only in words, but by His whole life and by His death, did He carry out His doctrine of the non-resistance of evil.

Believers listen to all this. They hear it in their churches, persuaded that the words are divine; they call Him God, but they say: —

“All this is very good, but it is impossible as society is now organized; it would derange our whole life, which we are accustomed to, and love! And so we believe it all, but only in this sense: That it is the ideal toward which humanity ought to strive; the ideal which is to be attained by prayer, and by believing in the sacraments, in the redemption, and in the resurrection of the dead.”

The others, the unbelievers, the free-thinkers, who comment on Christ's doctrine, the historians of religions, the Strausses, the Renans, — completely imbued with the teachings of the Church, which says that Christ's teaching has no direct application to life, but is a visionary doctrine, the consolation of feeble minds, tell us that it was all very well preached in the fishermen's huts by Galilee; but that for us it is only the sweet dream *du charmant docteur*, as Renan calls Him.

In their opinion Christ could not rise to the height of comprehending all the wisdom attained by our civilization and culture. If He had stood on that height of cultivation whereon stand these learned men, He never would have uttered His charming nonsense about the birds of the air, the turning of the other cheek, the taking no thought for the morrow. These learned historians judge of the value of Christianity by what they see of it in our society. The Christianity of our society

and our time regards life, with its present organization, as true and sacred; with its prison-cells and solitary confinement, its alcazars, its factories, its newspapers, its houses of infamy, its parliaments; and only as much of Christ's teaching is accepted as does not interfere with this life. Since Christ's teaching is opposed to all this life, then nothing of it is accepted except the empty words. The historical critics see this, and, unlike the so-called believers, having no motives for concealment, submit this empty form of Christ's teaching to a profound analysis; they refute it systematically, and prove that Christianity is made up of nothing but chimerical ideas.

It would seem that before criticising Christ's teaching, it would be necessary to understand what it consisted of; and to decide whether His doctrine is reasonable or not, it would be well first to realize that He said exactly what He said. And this none of us do—either Church commentators or free-thinkers—and we know very well why we do not.

We know perfectly well that Christ's teaching repudiates and has always repudiated all human errors, all *tohu*, all the empty idols that we try to except from the category of errors, by dubbing them "Church," "State," "Culture," "Science," "Art," "Civilization." But Jesus spoke against all these, not excusing any form of *tohu*.

Not only Jesus, but all the Hebrew prophets, and John the Baptist, and all the true sages of the world, have denounced the Church and State and culture and civilization of their times as sources of man's perdition.

Imagine an architect who says to a house-owner, "Your house is good for nothing; it needs to be entirely rebuilt," and then describes how the supports are to be cut and where they are to be fastened. The proprietor turns a deaf ear to the words, "Your house is good for nothing, and needs to be rebuilt," and pretends to listen respectfully when the architect begins to discuss the internal changes and arrangements. Evidently, in this case, all the architect's advice will seem to be impracticable; and a less respectful house-owner would call it

nonsensical. Precisely in this way we treat Christ's teaching.

I give this illustration for want of a better. I remember now that Jesus, in teaching His doctrine, made use of the same comparison. "*Destroy this temple,*" He said, "*and in three days I will raise it up.*" And for this they crucified Him; and for this they now crucify His doctrine.

The least that can be asked of men who pass judgment upon any doctrine is that they shall judge of it as the teacher himself understood it. Jesus understood His doctrine, not as a distant ideal impossible of attainment, not as a collection of fantastic and poetical reveries with which to charm the simple-hearted inhabitants of Galilee; He understood it as a reality, a reality which should be the salvation of mankind. He was not dreaming as He hung on the cross, but He cried out and He died for His doctrine. And thus many men have died, and still die. It is impossible to say that such a doctrine is a dream.

All teaching of the truth is chimerical to those lost in error. We have gone so far that many people—and I was of the number—say that this teaching is chimerical because it is contrary to human nature. It is against nature, they say, to turn the other cheek when we have been struck, to give our own to others, to toil, not for ourselves, but for others. It is natural, they say, for a man to defend his person, his family, his property; that is to say, it is the nature of man to struggle for existence. A learned lawyer has proved scientifically that the most sacred duty of man is to defend his rights; that is, to fight.

But the moment we detach ourselves from the idea that the existing organization established by man is the best—is sacred,—the moment we do this, the objection that Christ's teaching is contrary to human nature is immediately turned against him who makes it. No one will deny that not only to kill or torture a man, but to torture a dog, to kill a fowl or a calf, is repugnant and painful to human nature. (I know men living by agricultural labor who have ceased to eat meat solely because it had

fallen to their lot to slaughter their animals.) And yet the whole organization of our life is such that every personal enjoyment is purchased at the price of human suffering contrary to human nature.

The whole organization of our life, all the complicated mechanism of our institutions, which are based on violence, testifies that violence is contrary to human nature.

No judge, though he has condemned the criminal to death according to the code, is willing to hang him with his own hands; no nachalnik would tear a muzhik from his weeping family and cast him into prison; no general or soldier, untrained by discipline and service in war, would slay a hundred Turks or Germans or destroy their village, or even wound a single man. Yet all these things are done, thanks to the complicated administrative and social machinery, the task of which is to divide responsibility for misdeeds in such a way that no one feels them to be contrary to nature.

One class of men makes the laws; another executes them; a third trains men to habits of discipline, that is, to automatic and unquestioning obedience; a fourth class — and these are the most severely trained of all — does all kinds of violence, even slay their fellows without knowing why or to what end. But let a man free himself in thought for a moment from this network of human organization in which he is entangled, and he will readily see that it is contrary to his nature.

Let us abstain from affirming that organized violence, of which we make use to our own profit, is a divine, immutable truth, and we shall see clearly which is most in harmony with human nature, — violence or the Christ's teaching.

What is the law of nature? Is it to know that my security and that of my family, all my amusements and pleasures, are purchased by the poverty, corruption, and suffering of millions, by the annual crop of criminals, by hundreds of thousands of suffering prisoners; by millions of soldiers and guardians of civilization, torn from their homes and stupefied by discipline, to protect

our pleasures with loaded revolvers against famishing men? Is it to purchase every fragment of bread that I put in my mouth and the mouths of my children by the numberless privations that are necessary to procure my abundance? Or is it to be certain that my piece of bread only belongs to me when I know that every one else has a share, and that no one suffers because of it.

It is only necessary to understand that, thanks to our social organization, each one of our pleasures, every minute of tranquillity under our organization of life, is obtained by the sufferings and privations of thousands held down by violence—it is only necessary to understand this to know what is conformable to human nature; not to our animal nature alone, but the animal and spiritual nature which constitutes man. When we once understand Christ's law in all its significance, with all its consequences, we shall understand that His teaching is not contrary to human nature; but that its sole object is to supplant the unnatural and chimerical law of the resistance of evil which makes their lives so unhappy.

Christ's teaching regarding the non-resistance of evil vain!¹ How about the life of those in whose hearts love and compassion for their kind were originally planted—but who make ready for their fellow-men punishment at the stake, by the knout, the wheel, the rack, chains, compulsory labor, the gibbet, solitary confinement, prisons for women and children, the slaughter of tens of thousands in war, or bring about periodical revolutions and Pugachof rebellions; of those who carry these horrors into execution; of those who benefit by these horrors; of those who try to avoid these sufferings and take their revenge for them,—is not such a life vain?

We need only understand Christ's teaching to understand that this world,—not the world which God gave for the happiness of man, but the world men have organized to their own hurt,—that such an existence is a vanity, the most savage and horrible of vanities, a

¹ *Metchta*, a dream, illusion, vanity.

veritable delirium of madness, from which, when once we have been awakened, we do not again return to such a horrible delusion !

God descended to earth ; the Son of God, one person of the Trinity, became incarnate, redeemed Adam's sin, and (so we were taught to believe) this God said many mysterious and mystical things which are difficult to understand — which it is not possible to understand except by the aid of faith and grace — and suddenly the words of God are found to be so simple, so clear, and so reasonable ! God said, Do no evil to one another, and evil will cease to exist. Was the revelation from God really so simple — nothing but that ? It would seem that we all might understand it, it is so simple !

The prophet Elijah, a fugitive from men, took refuge in a cave, and was told that God would appear to him. There came a great wind, — the trees were uprooted. Elijah thought that this was God, and he looked, but the Lord was not in the wind. After the wind came tempest ; the thunder and the lightning were terrific and Elijah went to see if God was there ; but God was not there. Then came an earthquake : the earth belched forth fire, the rocks were shattered, the mountains were rent ; Elijah looked for the Lord, but God was not in the earthquake. Then it became calm ; a gentle breeze came to the prophet, bearing the freshness of the fields ; and Elijah looked, and God was there. Such are these simple words of God — "*Resist not evil.*"

They are very simple, but, nevertheless, they express God's law and man's law, one and eternal. This law is to such a degree eternal that if there has been in history a progressive movement for the suppression of evil, it is due to the men who understood the doctrine of Jesus — who endured evil and resisted not evil by violence. The advance of humanity toward righteousness is due, not to the tyrants, but to the martyrs. As fire cannot extinguish fire, so evil cannot suppress evil. Only good, confronting evil and resisting its contagion, can overcome evil. And in the inner world of the human soul, the law is as absolute as was even the law of Galileo,

more absolute, more clear, more immutable. Men may turn aside from it, they may hide its truth from others; but the progress of humanity toward righteousness can be attained only in this way. Every forward step must be taken only in the name of the non-resistance of evil. A disciple of Christ may say now, with greater assurance than did Galileo, in spite of misfortunes and threats: "And yet it is not violence, but good, that overcomes evil." If the progress is slow, it is because Christ's teaching (which, through its clearness, simplicity, and wisdom, appeals so inevitably to human nature), has been most cunningly and dangerously hidden from the majority of mankind under an entirely different teaching falsely called His.

CHAPTER V

THE true meaning of Christ's teaching was revealed to me; everything confirmed its truth. But for a long time I could not accustom myself to the strange idea, that after the eighteen centuries during which Christ's law had been professed by milliards of human beings, after thousands of men had consecrated their lives to the study of this law, I had discovered it for myself as something new.

But strange as it seemed, so it was. Christ's teaching regarding the non-resistance of evil was to me wholly new, something of which I had never before had the slightest conception. I asked myself how this could be; I must certainly have had a false idea of Christ's teaching to cause such a misunderstanding. And a false idea of it I unquestionably had.

When I began to read the Gospel, I was not in the condition of a man who, having heard nothing of Christ's teaching, becomes acquainted with it for the first time; on the contrary, I had a preconceived theory as to the manner in which I ought to understand it. Christ did not appear to me as a prophet revealing the divine law, but as one who continued and amplified the absolute

divine law which I already knew; for I had very definite and complex notions about God, about the creation of the world and of man, and about the commandments of God given to men through the instrumentality of Moses.

In the Gospels I came to the words, "*It has been said to you, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, That you resist not evil.*" These words, "*An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,*" was the law given by God to Moses; the words, "*But I say unto you, That you resist not evil,*" was a new law which denied the first.

If I had simply referred to Christ's teaching without the theological theory that I had imbibed with my mother's milk, I should simply have understood the simple meaning of Christ's words. I should have understood that Christ abrogated the old law, and gave His new law. But I had been taught that Christ did not abrogate the law of Moses, but that, on the contrary, He confirmed it to the slightest iota, and that He made it more complete.

Verses 17-20 of the fifth chapter of Matthew in which this was included had always impressed me, when I read the Gospel, by their obscurity, and they plunged me into doubt. I knew the Old Testament, particularly the last books of Moses, very thoroughly, and recalling certain passages in which minute doctrines, often absurd and even cruel in their purport, are preceded by the words, "And the Lord said unto Moses," it seemed to me very singular that Christ should confirm all these injunctions; I could not understand why He did so. But I allowed the question to pass without solution, and accepted with confidence the explanations inculcated in my infancy, — that the two laws were equally inspired by the Holy Spirit, that they were in perfect accord, and that Christ confirmed the law of Moses while completing and amplifying it.

I never gave myself any clear account as to the method by which this fulfilment should come about, how the contradictions apparent throughout the whole Gospel,

in verses 17-20 of the fifth chapter, and in the words, "*But I say unto you,*" should be reconciled.

Now that I understood the clear and simple meaning of Christ's teaching, I saw clearly that the two laws are directly opposed to one another; that they can never be harmonized; that, instead of supplementing one by the other, we must inevitably choose between the two; and that the received explanation of the verses, Matthew v. 17-20, which had impressed me by their obscurity, must be incorrect.

When I now came to read once more the verses that had before impressed me as so obscure, I was astonished at the clear and simple meaning which was suddenly revealed to me. This meaning was revealed, not by any combination and transposition, but solely by rejecting the artificial explanations with which the words had been encumbered. Christ said:—

*"Think not that I am come to destroy the law or (the teaching of) the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, sooner shall heaven and earth pass, than one jot or one tittle shall pass from the law, till all be fulfilled."*¹

And in verse 20 He added:—

"For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Christ said:—

I am not come to destroy the eternal law of whose fulfilment your books and prophecies foretell. I am come to teach you the fulfilment of the eternal law; not of the law that your scribes and Pharisees call the divine law, but of that eternal law which is less subject to change than the earth and the heavens.

I have expressed the idea in other words in order to detach the thoughts of my readers from the traditional false interpretation. If this false interpretation had never existed, the idea expressed in the verses could not be rendered in a better or more definite manner.

The view that Jesus did not abrogate the old law

¹ Matt. v. 17, 18.

arises from the arbitrary conclusion that "law" in this passage signifies the written law instead of the law eternal, the reference to the iota—jot and tittle—perhaps furnishing the grounds for such an opinion. But Christ was not speaking of the written law. If Christ in this place had been speaking of the written law, He would have used the expression "the law and the prophets," which He always employed in speaking of the written law; here, however, He uses a different expression,— "the law *or* the prophets." If Christ had meant the written law, He would have used the expression, "the law and the prophets," in the verses that follow and that continue the thought; but He says, briefly, "the law," and without any addition as it stands in this verse. Moreover, according to the Gospel of Luke, Christ made use of the same phraseology, and the context renders the meaning inevitable. According to Luke, Jesus is speaking to the Pharisees, who assumed the justice of their written law. He says:—

*"You justify yourselves before men; but God knows your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God. The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presses into it. And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail."*¹

In the words, "*The law and the prophets were until John*," Jesus abrogated the written law; in the words, "*And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail*," Christ confirmed the law eternal. In the first passage cited He said, "the law *and* the prophets," that is, the written law; in the second He said "the law" simply, therefore the law eternal. It is clear, then, that the eternal law is opposed to the written law,² exactly as in the context of Matthew, where the eternal law is defined by the phrase, "the law *or* the prophets."

¹ Luke xvi. 15-17.

² More than this, as if to do away with all doubt as to which law He referred, Jesus cites immediately, in connection with this passage, the most

The history of the variants of the text of these verses is quite worthy of notice. The majority of manuscripts have simply "the law," without the addition, "and the prophets." By such a reading there can be no misinterpretation that it signifies the written law. In other manuscripts, notably Tischendorf's, and the canonical, we find the word "prophets" used, not with the conjunction "and," but with the conjunction "or," — "the law *or* the prophets," — which also excludes any question of the written law, and indicates the law eternal.

In several manuscripts, not countenanced by the Church, we find the word "prophets" used with the conjunction "and," not with "or"; and in these versions every repetition of the words "the law" is followed by the phrase, "and the prophets." So that the sense as expressed in this transformation would indicate that Christ spoke only of the written law.

These variants furnish a history of the commentaries on the passage. The only clear meaning is that authorized by Luke, — that Christ spoke of the eternal law. But among the copyists of the Gospels were some who desired that the written law of Moses should continue to be regarded as obligatory. They therefore added to the words "the law" the phrase "and the prophets," and changed the sense.

Other Christians, not recognizing the books of Moses, either suppressed the added phrase, or replaced the particle *καί*, "and," with *ή*, "or"; and with this substitution the passage was admitted to the canon. Nevertheless, in spite of the unequivocal clearness of the text as thus written, the commentators perpetuated the interpretation supported by the phrase which had been rejected in the canon. The passage evoked innumerable comments, which stray from the true signification in proportion to the lack, on the part of the commen-

decisive instance of the negation of the law of Moses by the eternal law, the law of which not the smallest jot is to fail: "*Whosoever puts away his wife, and marries another, commits adultery*" (Luke xvi. 18). That is, according to the written law divorce is permissible; according to the eternal law it is a sin. — AUTHOR'S NOTE.

tators, of fidelity to the simple and obvious meaning of Christ's teaching, and the majority of them recognize the apocryphal reading rejected by the canonical text.

To be absolutely convinced that in these verses Christ spoke only of the eternal law, we need only examine the true meaning of the word that has given rise to so many false interpretations. The word "law" (in Greek νόμος, in Hebrew תּוֹרָה, *torah*) has in all languages two principal meanings: one, law in the abstract sense, independent of formulæ; the other, the written statutes which men generally recognize as law.

In the Greek of Paul's Epistles the distinction is indicated by the use of the article. Without the article Paul uses νόμος the most frequently in the sense of the eternal law of God.

By the ancient Hebrews, in the prophets, in Isaiah, תּוֹרָה, *torah*, is always used in the sense of an eternal, ineffable revelation, God's own teaching. Not till the time of Esdras, and later in the Talmud, was "Torah," the law, used to distinguish the five books of Moses, just as with us the word "Bible" is used — with this difference, that while we have words to distinguish between the Bible and the law of God, the Jews employed the same word to express both meanings.

And so Christ, using the word law, "torah," sometimes uses it as Isaiah and the other prophets use it, in the sense of the law of God which is eternal, in this case sanctioning it; and sometimes in the sense of the written law of the Pentateuch, rejecting it. But to distinguish the difference, He always, in speaking of the written law to reject it, adds "and the prophets," or prefixes the word "your," — "your law."

When He says, "*Therefore all things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets,*"¹ He speaks of the written law. The entire written law, He says, may be reduced to this one expression of the eternal law, and by these words He abrogated the written law. When He says, "*The law and the prophets were until John the*

¹ Matt. vii. 12.

Baptist,"¹ He speaks of the written law, and by these words denies its obligatoriness. When He says, "*Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keeps the law,*"² or "*It is also written in your law,*"³ or "*that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law,*"⁴ He speaks of the written law, the law whose authority He denied, the law that condemned Him to death: "*The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die.*"⁵ It is plain that this Jewish law, which authorized condemnation to death, was not the law which Christ taught. But when Christ says, "*I am not come to destroy the law, but to teach you the fulfilment of the law; for nothing of this law shall be changed, but all shall be fulfilled,*" then He is speaking, not of the written law, but of the divine and eternal law, and sanctions it.

But let us grant that all this is merely formal proof; let us grant that I have carefully combined contexts and variants, and excluded everything contrary to my theory; let us grant that the commentators of the Church are clear and convincing, that, in fact, Christ did not abrogate the law of Moses, but upheld it in all its force, — let us grant this: but even then what were Christ's teachings?

According to the interpretations of the Church, He taught that He was the second person of the Trinity, the Son of God the Father, and that He came into the world to atone by His death for Adam's sin. But every one who has read the Gospels knows that Christ taught nothing of the sort, or at least spoke but very vaguely on these topics. Let us even grant that we cannot read correctly and that He does speak of this. Well, in any case, the passages in which Christ affirms that He is the second person of the Trinity, and that He was to atone for the sins of humanity, form the most inconsiderable and obscurest portion of the Gospels.

In what, then, does the rest of Christ's teaching consist? It is impossible to deny, and all Christians have

¹ Luke xvi. 16.

² John viii. 17.

³ John xix. 7.

⁴ John vii. 19.

⁵ John xv. 25.

always recognized the fact, that the chief aim of Christ's teaching is to regulate men's lives, — how they ought to live with regard to one another. But to realize that Jesus taught men a new way of life, we must have some idea of the condition of the people to whom His teachings were addressed.

When we examine into the social development of the Russians, or the English, or the Chinese, or the Indians, or even the savages living on islands, we find that each people invariably has certain practical rules or laws of life; consequently, if any one would inculcate a new law of life, he must by this very teaching abolish the former law of life; if he did not abolish it, he could not teach. So it would be in England, in China, or in Russia; in any race or nation this would be inevitable. Laws that we are accustomed to regard as precious, as almost sacred, he would assuredly abrogate; with us, perhaps, it might happen that a reformer who taught a new law would abolish only our civil laws, the official code, our administrative customs, without touching what we consider as our divine laws, although it is difficult to believe that such could be the case.

But with the Jewish people, who had but one law, and wholly divine, — and embracing life in all its minutest details, — what could a reformer reform if he declared in advance that the existing law was inviolable?

But even if we grant it, this is no proof. Let those that interpret Christ's words as an affirmation of the entire Mosaic law explain to their own satisfaction who it was that Christ denounced during the whole of His ministry, who it was He opposed, calling them Pharisees, scribes, doctors of the law? Who were they that rejected Christ's teaching, and, their high priests at their head, crucified Him? If Christ approved the law of Moses, where were the faithful followers of that law, who practised it sincerely, and must thereby have obtained Christ's approval? Is it possible that there was not one such?

The Pharisees, we are told, constituted a sect. The

Hebrews do not say so; they say the Pharisees were the true performers of the law. But let us grant they were a sect. The Sadducees also were a sect. Where, then, were those that did not belong to a sect, the genuine ones?

In the Gospel of John all of Christ's enemies are spoken of directly as "the Jews." They agree with Christ's teaching, and they are hostile to Him because they are Jews. But in the Gospels not only the Pharisees and the Sadducees are shown as the enemies of Jesus: the doctors of the law, those that interpret the law, the elders, those that are always considered as representatives of the people's wisdom, are also called Christ's enemies.

Christ said, "*I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance,*" to change their way of life (*μετανοια*). But where were the righteous? Was Nicodemus the only one? He is represented as a good but misguided man.

We are so habituated to the singular opinion that Christ was crucified by the Pharisees and a few wicked Jews, that it never occurs to us to ask the simple question, "Where were the true Jews, the good Jews, the Jews that practised the law?" When we have once propounded this query, everything becomes perfectly clear. Christ, whether he was God or man, brought His teaching to a people possessing a law, called the law of God, governing their whole existence. How must Christ have comported Himself toward that law?

Every prophet, every founder of a religion, in revealing the law of God to men, inevitably meets with what these men regard as the law of God; and he cannot avoid a double use of the word "law," one expressing what his hearers wrongfully consider the law of God — "your law;" and the other the law he has come to proclaim, the true, the eternal, law of God. A reformer not only cannot avoid this double use of the word; often he does not wish to avoid it, but purposely confounds the two ideas, thus indicating that, in the law confessed by those whom he would convert, there are still some

eternal truths, and every reformer takes these, laws such as embody the truth, as the basis of his teaching.

This is precisely what Christ did among the Hebrews, by whom the two laws were alike called "torah." Christ recognized that the Mosaic law, and still more the prophets, especially the writings of Isaiah, whose words He constantly quotes, contained divine and eternal truths in harmony with the eternal law, and these — as, for instance, love to God and your neighbor — He takes as the basis of His own teaching.

Christ many times expresses this thought. Thus He said, "*What is written in the law? how readest thou?*"¹ Even in the law one can find eternal truth, if one reads it aright. And more than once He affirms that the commandments of the Mosaic law, to love the Lord and one's neighbor, are also commandments of the eternal law. At the conclusion of all the parables by which Christ explained the meaning of His teaching to His disciples, He pronounced words which have a bearing upon all that precedes: —

"*Therefore every scribe instructed in the truth is like a householder who brings forth out of his treasure (altogether without distinction) things new and old.*"²

The Church universal understands these words just exactly as they were understood by St. Irenæus; but, at the same time, in defiance of the true signification, it arbitrarily attributes to them the meaning that everything old is sacred. The manifest meaning is this: —

He who seeks for the good, takes not only the new, but also the old; and because a thing is old, he does not therefore reject it. By these words Christ meant that He did not deny what was eternal in the old law. But when they spoke to Him of the whole law, or of the formalities exacted by the old law, His reply was that new wine should not be put into old bottles. Christ could not affirm the whole law; neither could He deny the entire teachings of the law and the prophets, — the law in which it says, "*love thy neighbor as thyself*," and the prophets whose words He often used to express His

¹ Luke x. 26.

² Matt. xiii. 52.

own thoughts. And yet, in place of this clear and simple explanation of Christ's simple words, we are offered a vague interpretation which introduces needless contradictions, which reduces the doctrine of Jesus to nothingness, and which reestablishes the doctrine of Moses in all its savage cruelty.

Commentators of the Church, particularly those that have written since the fifth century, tell us that Christ did not abolish the written law, but sanctioned it. But in what way did He sanction it? How can Christ's law harmonize with the law of Moses? To this there is no reply. The commentators all make use of a verbal juggle and say that Christ fulfilled the law of Moses, and that the prophecies were fulfilled in His person, and that Christ fulfilled the law as our mediator by our faith in Him. And only the essential question for every believer — How to harmonize two conflicting laws, each designed to regulate the lives of men? — is left without any attempt at explanation. Thus the contradiction between the verse where it is said that Christ did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil the law, and the verse where it says, "*You have heard But I say unto you,*" — the contradiction between the spirit of the teaching of Moses and the teaching of Christ, — is left in all its force.

Let any one interested in this question look through the Church commentaries touching this passage from the time of John Chrysostom to our day. After a perusal of these long explanations, he will be convinced not only that there is no solution for the contradiction, but that there is an artificially introduced contradiction where there had been none before.

The impossible attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable prove that this reconciliation is not an error of thought, but that the reconciliation has a clear and definite object, that it is necessary. And it is evident why it is necessary.

Here is what John Chrysostom says in reply to those that reject the law of Moses: —

"Further testing the old law, wherein it is commanded to extort an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, the

objection is instantly made: 'How can he be blessed who says that? What shall we say to that?' This: that, on the contrary, it is the greatest sign of divine philanthropy.

"He made this law, not that we might strike out one another's eyes, but that fear of suffering by others might restrain us from doing any such thing to them. As, therefore, He threatened the Ninevites with overthrow, not that he might destroy them (for had that been His will, He ought to have been silent), but that He might by fear make them better, and so quiet His wrath: so also hath He appointed a punishment for those who wantonly assail the eyes of others, that if good principle dispose them not to refrain from such cruelty, fear may restrain them from injuring their neighbors' sight.

"And if this be cruelty, it is cruelty also for the murderer to be restrained, and the adulterer checked. But these are the sayings of senseless men, and of those that are mad to the extreme of madness. For I, so far from saying that this comes of cruelty, should say that the contrary to this would be unlawful, according to men's reckoning. And whereas thou sayest, 'Because He commanded to pluck out *an eye for an eye*, therefore He is cruel'; I say that if He had not given this commandment, then He would have seemed, in the judgment of most men, to be that which thou sayest He is."

John Chrysostom clearly recognized the law, *An eye for an eye*, as divine, and the contrary of that law, that is, the Christ's teaching about the non-resistance of evil, as an iniquity. "For let us suppose," says Chrysostom further:—

"For let us suppose that this law had been altogether done away, and that no one feared the punishment ensuing thereupon, but that license had been given to all the wicked to follow their own dispositions in all security, to adulterers, and to murderers, to perjured persons, and to parricides; would not all things have been turned upside down? would not cities, market-places and houses, sea and land, and the whole world, have been filled with unnumbered pollutions and murders? Every one sees

it. For if, when there are laws, and fear, and threatening, our evil dispositions are hardly checked; were even this security taken away, what is there to prevent men's choosing vice? and what degree of mischief would not then come reveling upon the whole of human life?

"The rather, since cruelty lies not only in allowing the bad to do what they will, but in another thing too quite as much, — to overlook, and leave uncared for, him who hath done no wrong, but who is without cause or reason suffering ill. For tell me; were any one to gather together wicked men from all quarters, and arm them with swords, and bid them go about the whole city, and massacre all that came in their way, could there be anything more like a wild beast than he? And what if some others should bind, and confine with the utmost strictness, those whom that man had armed, and should snatch from those lawless hands them who were on the point of being butchered; could anything be greater humanity than this?"

St. John Chrysostom does not say what would be the estimate of these others in the opinion of the wicked. And what if these others were themselves wicked and cast the innocent into prison? Chrysostom continues:—

"Now then, I bid thee transfer these examples to the Law likewise; for He that commands to pluck out *an eye for an eye* hath laid the fear as a kind of strong chain upon the souls of the bad, and so resembles him who detains those assassins in prison; whereas he who appoints no punishment for them, doth all but arm them by such security, and acts the part of that other, who was putting the swords in their hands, and letting them loose over the whole city."¹

If John Chrysostom had understood the law of Jesus, he would have said, Who is it that strikes out another's eyes and casts men into prison? If He who commanded to take an eye for an eye — in other words, if God Himself did such things, then there would be no contradiction; but men must do this, and the Son of God has said to these men that they must not do it. God commanded

¹ "Homilies on the Gospel of St. Matthew," xvi.

to strike out teeth and the Son of God commanded not to strike them out ! We must accept one commandment or the other ; and John Chrysostom, and since his day the whole Church, has accepted the commandment of God-the-Father, that is, of Moses, and denied that of God-the-Son, in other words, of the Christ, whose teaching it nevertheless claims to believe !

Christ abolished the Mosaic law, and gave His own law in its place. To one who really believes in Christ there is not the slightest contradiction ; such an one will pay no attention to the law of Moses, but will believe in Christ's law and put it into practice. To one who believes in the law of Moses there is also no contradiction. The Jews regard Christ's words as foolish, and believe in the law of Moses. The contradiction is only for those who would live according to the law of Moses, but persuade themselves and others that they believe in Christ's law — for those whom Christ denounced as hypocrites, as a generation of vipers.

Instead of recognizing as divine truth the one or the other of the two laws, the law of Moses or Christ's, both are considered divine.

But when the question touches the acts of everyday life, Christ's law is rejected and that of Moses is followed. And in this false interpretation, when we realize its importance, is the source of that terrible, that horrible, drama of the struggle between evil and good, between darkness and light.

Christ made His appearance among the Jewish people, trained to the innumerable formal regulations instituted by the Levites in the rubric of divine laws, each preceded by the words, "And the Lord said unto Moses." He found everything, to the minutest detail, prescribed by rule ; not only the relation of man with God, but his sacrifices, his feasts, his fasts, his social, civil, and family duties, the details of personal habits, circumcision, the purification of the body, of domestic utensils, of clothing, — all these regulated by laws recognized as God's command and therefore as God's law.

What could any prophet, even the most ordinary

teacher — I don't say the Christ-God — do in establishing his own doctrines among such a people, but abolish the law by which all these details were regulated? Christ, like all the prophets, selected from what men considered as the law of God the portions that were really the law of God; He took what served His purpose, rejected the rest, and on this foundation established His revelation of the eternal law. It was not necessary to abolish all, but inevitable to abrogate much that was looked upon as obligatory.

This Christ did, and was accused of destroying what was considered the law of God; for this He was condemned and put to death. But His teaching remained among His disciples, traversed the centuries, and is transmitted to other peoples. Under these conditions there have grown up again on this new teaching a crop of similar commentaries and explanations, and pitiable human sophisms have replaced the divine revelation. For the formula, "And the Lord said unto Moses," we substitute "Thus saith the Holy Spirit." And again the letter hides the spirit.

Most astounding of all, Christ's teaching is amalgamated with all that "torah," with the written law, the authority of which He was forced to deny. This "torah," this written law, is declared to have been inspired by the Holy Spirit, the spirit of truth; and thus Christ is taken in the snare of His own revelation — and all His doctrine is reduced to nothingness.

This is why, after eighteen hundred years, it so singularly happened that I discovered the meaning of Christ's teaching as some new thing.

But no, I did not discover it; I did simply what all men have done and must do who seek after God and His law; I found what is the eternal law of God amid all that men call by that name.

CHAPTER VI

WHEN I understood Christ's law as Christ's law, and not as the law of Moses and of Christ, when I understood the commandment of this law which directly abrogated the law of Moses, then the Gospels, so obscure, diffuse, and contradictory before, blended for me into a harmonious whole, the substance of whose doctrine, until then incomprehensible, I found to be formulated in terms simple, clear, and accessible to every searcher after truth.¹

Throughout the Gospels it speaks of Christ's commands and the necessity of practising them. All the theologians discuss Christ's commands; but I did not know before what these commands were. I thought that Christ's command consisted in loving God, and one's neighbor as one's self. I did not see that this could not be Christ's command, since it was given by the ancients (Deuteronomy and Leviticus). The words:—

*"Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven,"*²—these words I believed to relate to the Mosaic law. But it never had occurred to me that Christ's new commands were clearly and precisely formulated in Matthew v. 21-48, and I did not see that in the passage where Christ says, *"Ye have heard that it was said But I say unto you,"* He formulated a series of very definite commands—five entirely new, counting as one the two references to adultery. I had heard of the beatitudes and of their number; their explanation and enumeration had formed a part of my religious instruction; but I had never heard anything about Christ's commands spoken of. To my astonishment, I was forced to discover them for myself. And this is how I discovered them. In the fifth chapter of Matthew I found these verses:—

¹ Matt. v. 21-48, especially 38.

² Matt. v. 19.

"You have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment:¹ (22) But I say unto you, That whoever is angry with his brother without cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the Sanhedrim: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of the fiery Gehenna. (23) Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; (24) Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go away; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. (25) Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. (26) Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing."

When I understood the command about non-resistance of evil, it seemed to me that these verses must have a meaning as clear and practical as has the command about resistance of evil. The meaning I had formerly given to the passage was, that every one ought to avoid angry feelings against others, ought never to utter abusive language, and ought to live in peace with all men, without exception. But there was in the text a phrase which excluded this meaning, "Whosoever shall be angry with his brother *without cause*" — the words could not then be an exhortation to absolute peace.

These two words² perplexed me, and I turned to the commentators, the theologians, for the removal of my doubts. To my surprise I found that the commentaries of the Church Fathers were chiefly occupied with the endeavor to define under what conditions anger was permissible and when it was not permissible. All the commentators of the Church dwelt on the qualifying phrase "*without cause*," and explained the meaning to be that one must not be offended without a reason, that one must not be abusive, but that anger is not always

¹ Is. xx. 13.

² One in Russian, *naprasno*.

wrong; and, to confirm their view, they quoted instances of anger on the part of saints and apostles.

I could not help acknowledging that the explanation, that anger "for the glory of God" according to their expression, is not reprehensible, although entirely contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, was based on the phrase, "without cause," in the twenty-second verse. These words changed the meaning of the whole passage.

Be not angry without cause. Christ exhorts us to pardon every one, to pardon without limit. He pardoned all who did Him wrong, and chided Peter for being angry with Malchus when Peter sought to defend his Master at the time of the betrayal, when, if at any time, it would seem that it was not without cause. And yet this same Christ in His instructions to all men said, "Be not angry without a cause," and thereby sanctioned anger for a cause. Christ enjoined peace upon all simple men, and suddenly in the phrase, "without a cause," interpolates the reservation that this rule does not apply to all cases; that there are circumstances under which one might be angry with a brother! In the commentaries it says that anger is sometimes expedient!

But who is to decide, I asked, when anger is expedient? I never have as yet encountered an angry person who thought his wrath unjustifiable. All think their anger legitimate and serviceable. The phrase "without cause" destroys the entire force of the verse!

And yet there were the words in the sacred text, and I could not efface them. The effect was the same as if the word "good" had been added to the phrase. "Love thy neighbor"—love thy good neighbor, the neighbor that agrees with thee!

The entire signification of the passage was changed for me by the phrase, "without cause." Verses 23 and 24, which exhort us to be reconciled with all men before we pray, also lost their direct and imperative meaning, and acquired a conditional import through the influence of the foregoing qualification.

It had seemed to me that Christ must forbid all anger, all ill will, and, that it might cease, exhorted us before

entering into communion with God to ask ourselves if there were any person who might be angry with us.

If such were the case, whether this anger were with cause or without cause, He commanded us to be reconciled. In this manner I had interpreted the passage; but it now seemed, according to the commentators, that the injunction must be taken as a conditional affirmation.

The commentators all explained that we ought to try to be at peace with all men; but, they added, if this is impossible, if, actuated by evil instincts, any one is at enmity with you, try to be reconciled with him in spirit, in idea, and then the enmity of others will be no obstacle to divine communion.

Moreover that he who said "raca," and "thou fool,"¹ was so terribly guilty always seemed to me strange and absurd. If we are forbidden to be abusive, why were examples chosen of abuse so feeble and almost free from abuse; why this terrible threat against any one who utters abuse so feeble as that implied in the word *raca*, which means a good-for-nothing? All this was obscure to me.

I was convinced that I had before me a problem similar to that which had confronted me in the words, "*Judge not.*" I felt that here again what was simple, serious, precise, and practical had been transferred to the domain of the foggy and the vague. I felt that Christ, in saying, "*be reconciled to thy brother,*" could not have meant, "be reconciled in thought," as they explained it. What does "reconciled in thought" mean? I understood what Jesus meant when, using the words of the prophet, He said, "*I will have mercy, and not sacrifice;*" that is, love to men. If you wish to please God, then, before offering prayer morning and evening, at mass or at the vesper service, remember who is angry with you, and go and arrange it so that he will no longer be angry with you, and then pray if you desire. But how about this phrase, "be reconciled in thought"?

¹ Russian, *bezumnui*, foolish, senseless.

I felt that what seemed to me the only clear and direct meaning of the verse was destroyed by the phrase "without cause." If I could eliminate that, the meaning would be plain. But all the commentators were united against my understanding of it; against it was the canonical text with the phrase, "without cause." If I dropped the words in this case, I might do the same in other cases arbitrarily, and others might follow my example. The whole difficulty lay in one word. If it were not for that one word everything would be clear. So I tried to explain it philologically so that it would not conflict with the sense of the entire passage.

I consulted the lexicons. In ordinary Greek, the word *εἰκῆ* means "heedlessly, inconsiderately." I tried to find some term that would not destroy the sense; but the words, "without a cause," plainly had the meaning attributed to them. In New Testament Greek the signification of *εἰκῆ* is exactly the same. I consulted the concordances. The word occurs but once in the Gospels, namely, in this passage. In the Epistles it is used several times. In the first epistle to the Corinthians, xv. 2, it occurs in exactly the same sense. It was impossible to interpret it otherwise; we must acknowledge that Christ said, *Be not angry without cause*. I had to acknowledge that for me to admit that Christ could utter in such vague words a command easily so construed as to be of no effect seemed to me equivalent to rejecting the entire Gospel.

There remained one *last hope!* — is the word to be found in all the manuscripts? I consulted Griesbach, where all variants are recorded — that is to say, how, in what manuscripts, and in which of the Fathers any given expression is employed. I consulted this authority, and discovered to my joy that in this passage there are marginal notes, there are variants. I examined further the variants. All refer to the word *εἰκῆ*. In most of the Gospel texts and the citations of the Fathers this word does not occur. That proved that the majority were on my side. I consulted Tischendorf for the most ancient reading; the word *εἰκῆ* did not appear. I looked into

Luther's version whereby I might get hold of this, the shortest way — here again this word does not occur.

So then this word, which destroyed the whole meaning of Christ's teaching, is a fifth century interpolation which had not crept into the best copies of the Gospel. Some copyist added the word; others approved it and undertook its explanation.

Christ did not utter, could not have uttered, this horrible word; and the primary, simple, direct meaning of the whole passage which impressed me and impresses every one is the true one.

But, moreover, now that I understand that Christ's words forbid all anger, whatever the cause, against any one whatever, the formerly confusing prohibition of the words "raca" and "fool," took on a meaning quite distinct from any prohibition with regard to the utterance of abusive epithets. The strange Hebrew word, *raca*, which is not translated in the Greek text, gave me that meaning. *Raca* means, literally, "vain, empty, that which does not exist." It was much used by the Hebrews to express exclusion. *Raca* signifies a man who is scarcely considered as a man. It is employed in the plural form, *rekin*, in Judges ix. 4, where it means "the lost," "the worthless." This word Jesus forbids us to apply to any one, as He forbids us to use the word "fool," which, like "raca," relieves us of all human obligations to a neighbor. We get angry, we do evil to men, and then to excuse ourselves we say that the object of our anger is a worthless or foolish man. Precisely such words as these Christ forbids us to use in speaking of men or to men. He exhorts us not to be angry with any one, and not to excuse our anger with the plea that we have to do with one worthless or foolish.

And so in place of insignificant, vague, and uncertain phrases subject to arbitrary interpretation, I found in Matthew v. 21-26 Christ's first commandment: Live in peace with all men. Regard not anger as justifiable under any circumstances. Never regard a human being as worthless or as a fool.¹ Not only refrain from all

¹ Matt. v. 22.

anger yourself, but do not regard the anger of others toward you justified. If any one is angry with you, even without reason, then before praying go and destroy that hostile feeling.¹ Strive first of all to efface the hostility between you and other men, lest animosity prevail to your loss.²

The first commandment of Jesus being thus freed from obscurity, I was able to understand the second, which also begins with a reference to the ancient law:—

“Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery:³ But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is better for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into gehenna. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is better for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into gehenna. It hath been said, Whoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement,⁴ but I say unto you, Whoever puts away his wife, saving for the sin of fornication, causes her to commit adultery: and whoever shall marry her that is divorced commits adultery.⁵

The significance of these words struck me thus: A man ought not, even in imagination, to admit that he could approach any woman save her to whom he had once been united, and her he might never abandon to take another, although permitted to do so by the Mosaic law.

In the first commandment, that against anger, the advice is given to extinguish anger at the very first, and the advice was illustrated by the parable of the man who is delivered to the judges; so here also Christ declares that debauchery arises from the fact that men and women regard one another as objects of lust. That this may

¹ Matt. v. 22, 23.

³ Ex. xx. 14, 28.

⁵ Matt. v. 27-32.

² Matt. v. 25, 26.

⁴ Deut. xxiv. 1.

not be so, we ought to put aside everything that may incite to lust, to avoid all that awakens lust, and, once united to a woman, never to abandon her on any pretext, for the abandonment of women leads also to divorce. Women thus abandoned seduce other men, and so debauchery is introduced into the world.

The wisdom of this commandment impressed me. It would suppress all the evils in the world that result from the sexual relations. Convinced that license in the sexual relations leads to contention, men, in obedience to this injunction, would avoid every cause for voluptuousness, and, knowing that the law of humanity is to live in couples, would so unite themselves, and never destroy the bond of union. All the evils arising from dissensions caused by sexual attraction would be suppressed, since there would be neither men nor women deprived of married life.

But now I was much more surprised, as I read the Sermon on the Mount, with the words, which had always surprised, "*saving for the cause of fornication*," which permitted a man to repudiate his wife in case of infidelity. To say nothing of the lack of dignity in the very form in which this thought was expressed, of the fact that here, side by side with what seemed to me the profoundest truths of the Sermon on the Mount, stood, like a note in a criminal code, this strange exception to the general rule, an exception which was diametrically opposed to the fundamental idea.

I consulted the commentators; all, Chrysostom¹ and the others, even learned theological critics like Reuss, recognized the meaning of the words to be that Christ permitted divorce in case of infidelity on the part of the woman, and that, in the exhortation against divorce in the nineteenth chapter of Matthew, the words, *saving for the cause of fornication*, had the same signification. I read the thirty-second verse of the fifth chapter again and again, and it seemed to me that this could not signify sanction to divorce. To verify my doubts I consulted the various contexts, and I found in Matthew xix.,

¹ p. 365.

Mark x., Luke xvi., and in the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, affirmation of the doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage without any saving clause. In Luke xvi. 18 it is said :—

“Whoever puts away his wife, and marries another, commits adultery: and whoever marries her that is put away from her husband commits adultery.”

In Mark x. 5–12 the doctrine is also proclaimed without any exception whatever :—

“For the hardness of your heart he wrote for you this command. But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder. And in the house his disciples asked him again of the same matter. And he said unto them, Whoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, commits adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she commits adultery.”

The same idea is expressed in Matt. xix. 4–9. Paul, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, vii. 1–11, develops systematically the idea that the only way of preventing debauchery is that every man have his own wife, and every woman have her own husband, and that they mutually satisfy the sexual instinct; then he says, without equivocation, that husband or wife shall in no case abandon each other for the sake of intercourse with any one else.¹

According to Mark and Luke and Paul, divorce is forbidden. It is forbidden by the assertion repeated in two of the Gospels, that husband and wife are one flesh whom God hath joined together. It is forbidden in the teaching of Christ, who exhorts us to pardon every one, without excepting the adulterous woman. It is forbidden by the general sense of the whole passage, which explains

¹ *“Let not the wife depart from her husband: But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.”*

that divorce is provocative of debauchery, and for this reason that divorce with an adulterous woman is prohibited.

On what, then, is based the opinion that divorce is permissible in case of a woman's infidelity. On the words which had so impressed me in Matt. v. 32; the words every one takes to mean that Jesus permits divorce in case of adultery by the woman; the words, repeated in Matt. xix. 9, in many manuscripts of the Gospel, and by many Fathers of the Church, — the words, "*unless for the cause of adultery.*"

I studied these words carefully anew. For a long time I could not understand them. It seemed to me that there must be a defect in the translation, an exegesis; but I could not find where the source of the error was. The error was very plain.

In opposition to the Mosaic law, which declares that if a man take an aversion to his wife he may write her a bill of divorcement and send her out of his house — in opposition to this law Christ says: "*But I say unto you, That whoever shall put away his wife, saving for the sin of fornication, causes her to commit adultery.*"

I saw nothing in these words to allow us to affirm that divorce was either permitted or forbidden. It is only said that whoever shall put away his wife causes her to commit adultery, and then an exception is made with regard to a woman guilty of adultery. This exception, which throws the guilt of marital infidelity entirely upon the *woman* is, in general, strange and unexpected; but here, in relation to the context, it is simply absurd, for even the very doubtful meaning which might otherwise be attributed to it is wholly destroyed. Whoever puts away his wife exposes her to the crime of adultery, and yet a man is permitted to put away a wife guilty of adultery, as if a woman guilty of adultery would no more commit adultery after she were put away.

But this is not all; when I had examined this passage attentively, I found it also to be lacking in grammatical meaning. The words are, "*Whoever shall put away*

his wife, except for the fault of adultery, exposes her to the commission of adultery," — and the proposition is complete. It is said of a husband, that he, in putting away his wife, exposes her to the commission of the crime of adultery; what, then, is the purport of the qualifying phrase, "*except for the fault of adultery*"? If the proposition had been put in this form, "The husband that puts away his wife is guilty of adultery, unless the wife herself has been unfaithful," it would be grammatically correct.

But as the passage now stands, the subject, "The husband that puts," has no other predicate than the word "exposes." How then can the phrase "except for the fault of adultery" be connected with it? It is impossible to expose except for the adultery of the wife. Even if to the words "except for the fault of adultery," the words "on the wife's part" or "her part" were added, which they are not, even then these words could have no relation to the predicate, "exposes." These words, according to the received exegesis, relate to the predicate, "*Whoever puts away;*" but "whoever puts away" is not the principal predicate, the principal predicate is "exposes." What signifies then the phrase, *except for the fault of adultery*. It is plain that whether for or without the fault of adultery on the part of the woman, the husband who puts away his wife exposes her to the commission of adultery.

The proposition is analogous to the following sentence: Whoever deprives his son of food, except for the fault of cruelty, exposes him to the possibility of being cruel. This sentence evidently cannot mean that a father may refuse food to his son if the son is cruel. If it has any sense, it can only mean that a father who refuses food to his son, besides being cruel toward his son, exposes his son to the possibility of becoming cruel. And in the same way, the Gospel proposition would have a meaning if we could replace the words, "the fault of adultery," by libertinism, debauchery, or something analogous, expressing not an act but a quality.

And so I asked myself if the meaning here was not simply that whoever puts away his wife, besides being himself guilty of libertinism (since no one puts away his wife except to take another), exposes his wife also to the commission of adultery? If, in the original text, the word translated "adultery" or "fornication" had the meaning of libertinism, the meaning of the passage would be clear. And then I met with the same experience that had happened to me before in similar instances. The text confirmed my suppositions so that I could no longer have any doubt about it.

The first thing that struck my eyes in reading the text was that the word *πορνεία*, translated in common with *μοιχᾶσθαι*, "adultery" or "fornication," is an entirely different word from the latter. Could it not be that these two words are synonyms or used so in the Gospels? I consulted all the lexicons—the general lexicons and those of the New Testament Greek—and found that the word *πορνεία*, corresponding to *zanah* in Hebrew, to *fornicatio* in Latin, to *hurerei* in German, to *rasputstvo* in Russian, has a very precise meaning, and that it never in any lexicons has signified, and never can signify, the act of adultery, *adultère*, *Ehebruch*, as it has been translated. It signifies a state of depravity,—a quality, and never an act,—and never can be properly translated by "adultery" or "fornication." I found, moreover, that "adultery" is expressed throughout the Gospel, as well as in the passage under consideration, by the word *μοιχεύω*. I had only to correct the false translation, which had evidently been made intentionally, to render absolutely inadmissible the meaning attributed by commentators to this passage and to the context of the nineteenth chapter, and the sense in which the word *πορνεία* is related to the husband in the sentence would become perfectly plain.

A person acquainted with Greek would construe as follows: *παρεκτός*, "except, outside," *λόγου*, "the cause, the sin," *πορνείας*, "of libertinism," *ποιεῖ*, "obliges," *αὐτήν*, "her," *μοιχᾶσθαι*, "to commit adultery"—which rendering gives, word for word, Whoever puts away his

wife, besides the fault of libertinism, obliges her to be an adulteress.

We obtain the same meaning from Matt. xix. 9. When we correct the unauthorized translation of *πορνεία*, by substituting "libertinism" for "fornication," we see at once that the phrase *εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* cannot apply to "wife." And as the words *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* could signify nothing else than the fault of libertinism on the part of the husband, so the words *εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*, in the nineteenth chapter, can have no other than the same meaning. The phrase *εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* is, word for word, "if not for libertinism," not "on account of libertinism."

The meaning then becomes clear. Christ replies to the theory of the Pharisees, who held that a man who abandons his wife to marry another without the intention of giving himself up to libertinism does not commit adultery — Christ replies to this theory that the abandonment of a wife, that is, the cessation of sexual relations, even if not for the purpose of libertinism, but to marry another, is none the less adultery.

Thus we come at the simple meaning of this commandment — a meaning which accords with the whole doctrine, with the words of which it is the complement, with grammar, and with logic. This simple and clear interpretation, harmonizing so naturally with the doctrine and the words from which it was derived, I discovered after the most careful and prolonged research. In fact, read these words in German, or in French, where it is directly said, *pour cause d'infidélité*, or *à moins que cela ne soit pour cause d'infidélité*, and see if you can find any other meaning. The word *παρεκτὸς* in all lexicons, signifying *excepté*, *ausgenommen*, *krome*, *except*, is translated by the whole proposition *à moins que cela ne soit* — "except it be for." The word *πορνείας* is translated *infidélité*, *Ehebruch*. And here, on this premeditated alteration of the text, had been based an exegesis which destroyed the moral, and the religious, and the logical, and the grammatical meaning of Christ's words.

And thus once more I found a confirmation of the

awful and joyous truth that the meaning of Christ's teaching is simple and clear, that its affirmations are emphatic and precise, but that the commentaries upon the doctrine, inspired by a desire to sanction existing evil, have so obscured it that determined effort is demanded of him who would know the truth. It became evident to me that if the Gospels had come down to us half burned or effaced, it would have been easier to restore the true meaning of the text than to find that meaning now, beneath the accumulations of fallacious comments which have apparently no purpose save to conceal the doctrine they are supposed to expound. With regard to the passage under consideration, it is even more evident than before that to justify the divorce of some Joann the Terrible this ingenious pretext was employed to obscure the teaching about marriage. When we have thrown aside the commentaries, we escape from the fog and the uncertainty, and Christ's second command becomes precise and clear. "Give not yourself up to the pleasure arising from sexual lust. Let every man, unless he be a eunuch, that is, if he be justified in entering into the sexual relation, have one wife and one wife only, and every wife one husband and one husband only, and under no pretext whatever let this union be violated by either."

Immediately after the second commandment is another reference to the ancient law, followed by the third commandment:—

*"Again, you have heard that it has been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths:¹ But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: (35) Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great king. (36) Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. (37) But let your communications be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatever is more than these comes of evil."*²

¹ Levit. xix. 12; Deut. xxiii. 21, 34.

² Matt. v. 33-37.

This passage had always troubled me when I read it. It did not trouble me by its obscurity, like the passage about divorce; or by conflicting with other passages, like the authorization of anger for cause; or by the difficulty in the way of obedience, like the command to turn the other cheek,—it troubled me, on the contrary, by its very clearness, simplicity, and practicality. Side by side with rules the profundity and importance of which had filled me with awe and humiliation, was this saying, which seemed to me superfluous, frivolous, weak, and without consequence to me or to others. I naturally did not swear, either by Jerusalem, or by heaven, or by anything else, and it cost me not the least effort to refrain from doing so; on the other hand, it seemed to me that whether I swore or did not swear could not be of the slightest importance to any one. And desiring to find an explanation of this rule, which troubled me through its very simplicity, I consulted the commentators. In this case they helped me.

The commentators all found in these words a confirmation of the third commandment of Moses,—not to swear by the name of the Lord; they explained that Christ, like Moses, forbade employing God's name at all; but, moreover, the commentators still further explained that Christ's will not to take an oath was not always obligatory, and had no reference whatever to the oath which every citizen is obliged to take before the authorities. And they brought together Scripture citations, not to support the direct meaning of Christ's command, but to prove when it ought and ought not to be obeyed.

They claimed that Christ had Himself sanctioned the oath in the courts of justice by His reply, "*Thou hast said,*" to the high priest's words, "*I adjure thee by the living God;*" it is said that the apostle Paul invoked God to witness the truth of his words, which invocation was evidently equivalent to an oath; it is said that oaths were prescribed by the law of Moses, but the Lord did not forbid these oaths; it is said that only false oaths, the oaths of Pharisees and hypocrites, are forbidden.

As soon as I understood the sense and object of these

comments, I understood that Christ's regulation regarding the taking of oaths was not so insignificant, superficial, and easy as I had supposed, when, in the number of oaths forbidden by Christ, I had not reckoned the oath of fidelity to the State.

And I asked myself the question, Does not this passage contain an exhortation to abstain also from that oath of allegiance which the commentators of the Church are so zealous to justify? Does it not forbid us to take the oath indispensable to the assembling of men into political groups and the formation of a military caste? The soldier, that special instrument of violence, goes in Russia by the nickname of *prisyaga* (sworn in). If I had asked the grenadier how he solved the contradiction between the Gospels and military code, he would have replied that he had taken the oath, that is, that he had sworn on the Gospels. Such replies soldiers have always made to me. The oath is so indispensable to the organization of that terrible evil produced by war and armed coercion that in France, where Christianity is out of favor, nevertheless the oath remains in full force. If Christ had not said this, had not said in so many words, "Do not take an oath to any one," He ought to have said it! He came to suppress evil, and, if He did not condemn the oath, He left a terrible evil untouched.

It may be said, perhaps, that in Christ's time this evil was unperceived; but this is not true. Epictetus and Seneca declare against the taking of oaths of allegiance to any one. A similar rule is among the laws of Mani. The Jews in Christ's time made proselytes, and obliged them to take the oath.

How then can I say that Christ did not perceive this evil when He forbade it in clear, direct, and explicit terms? He said, "*I say unto you, Swear not at all.*" This expression is as simple, clear, and absolute as the expression, "*Judge not, condemn not,*" and is as little subject to explanation; moreover, He added to this, "*Let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these comes of evil.*"

You see, if obedience to Christ's teaching is always to fulfil God's will, how can a man swear to fulfil man's will? God's will cannot coincide with man's will. And this is precisely what Christ says in the same place. He says¹:—

"Swear not by thy head, because not only thy head but every hair on it is in God's power."

And the apostle James in his epistle says exactly the same thing.

In his epistle, toward the end, as if it were the summing up of everything, James says²:—

"But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by earth, neither by any other oath: but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation."

The apostle tells us clearly why we must not swear: the oath in itself may not be culpable, but by it men are condemned, and so we ought not to swear at all. How could the saying of Christ and His apostles be more clearly expressed?

My ideas had become so confused that for a long time I kept asking myself: Can it mean what it means? How can we all swear on the Gospels? It cannot be.

But, after having read the commentaries attentively, I saw that the impossible was a fact. The explanations of the commentators were in harmony with those they had offered concerning the other commands: judge not, be not angry, do not violate the marital bonds.

We have organized a social order which we cherish and regard as sacred. Christ, whom we recognize as God, comes and tells us that our social organization is wrong. We recognize Him as God, but we are not willing to renounce our social institutions.

What, then, are we to do? Add, if we can, the words "without a cause" to render void the command against anger; wherever it is possible, mutilate the sense of another law, just as dishonest and unjust judges have done; so reverse the meaning of the law that it shall say precisely the opposite; instead of the command absc-

¹ Matt. v. 36.

² James v. 12.

lutely forbidding divorce insert phraseology which permits divorce; and if there is no possible way of deriving an equivocal meaning, as in the case of the commands, "*Judge not, condemn not,*" and "*Swear not at all,*" then with the utmost effrontery openly violate the rule while affirming that we obey it.

In fact, the principal obstacle to a comprehension of the truth that the Gospel forbids all manner of oaths, and particularly the oath of allegiance, exists in the fact that pseudo-Christian commentators themselves, with unexampled audacity, take oath upon the Gospel itself. They make men swear by the Gospel, that is to say, they do just contrary to the Gospel. Why does it never occur to the man who is made to take an oath upon the cross and the Gospel, that the cross was made sacred only by the death of one who forbade all oaths, and that in kissing the sacred book he perhaps is pressing his lips upon the very page where is recorded the clear and direct commandment, "*Swear not at all*"?

But this audacity now no longer troubled me. I saw clearly that in Matt. v. 33-37 was the plain declaration of the third commandment, that we should take no oath, since all oaths are imposed for evil.

After the third commandment comes the fourth reference to the ancient law and the enunciation of the fourth commandment:—

*"It has been said to you, An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth: (39) But I say unto you, Resist not evil: but whoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. (40) And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. (41) And whoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. (42) Give to him that asks thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away."*¹

I have already spoken of the direct and precise meaning of these words; I have already said that we have no reason whatever for basing on them an allegorical ex-

¹ Matt. v. 38-42, Luke vi. 29, 30.

planation. The commentaries on these words from the time of John Chrysostom to our day are really surprising. The words are pleasing to every one, and they inspire all manner of profound reflections save one, — that these words have the very meaning that they have. The Church commentators, not at all awed by the authority of one whom they recognize as God, boldly distort the meaning of His words. They say: —

“Of course all these commands about enduring offences and refraining from reprisals are directed against the vindictive character of the Jews; they not only do not exclude all general measures for the repression of evil and the punishment of evil-doers, but they exhort every one to individual and personal effort to sustain justice, to apprehend aggressors, and to prevent the wicked from inflicting evil upon others, — for otherwise these spiritual commands of the Saviour would become, as they became among the Jews, a dead letter, and would serve only to propagate evil and to suppress virtue.

“The love of the Christian should be patterned after the divine love; but divine love limits and punishes evil only so far as it is more or less harmless toward the glory of God and the safety of His servants. In the contrary case we must limit evil and punish it, — which is the special duty of authorities.”¹

Christian scholars and free-thinkers are equally unembarrassed by the meaning of Christ's words, and they correct it. They say the sentiments here expressed are very noble, but are completely inapplicable to life; for if we practised to the letter the command, “*Resist not evil*,” we should destroy the entire social fabric which we have arranged so beautifully. Renan, Strauss, and all the liberal commentators say this.

If, however, we take Christ's words as we would take the words of any one who speaks to us, and admit that He says exactly what He does say, the necessity for all these profound circumlocutions is done away with.

¹ This citation is taken from the “Commentaries on the Gospel,” by the Archimandrite Michael, a work based upon the writings of the Fathers of the Church.

Christ says, "I find your social system absurd and wrong. I propose to you another." And then He utters the teachings reported by Matthew.¹ It would seem that before correcting them one ought to understand them; now this is exactly what no one wishes to do. We decide in advance that the social order in which we live, and which is abolished by these words, is the sacred law of humanity.

I did not consider our social order either wise or sacred; and that is why I have understood this command when others have not. And when I had understood these words just as they are written, I was struck with their truth, their lucidity, and their precision.

Christ said, "You wish to suppress evil by evil; this is not reasonable. To abolish evil, cease to do evil." And then He enumerates all the instances where we are in the habit of returning evil for evil, and says that in these cases we ought not so to do.

This fourth command of Christ was the one I first understood; and it revealed to me the meaning of all the others. This simple, clear, and practical fourth commandment says:—

"Never resist evil by force, never return violence for violence: if any one beat you, bear it; if one would deprive you of anything, yield to his wishes; if any one would force you to labor, labor; if any one would take away your property, give it up to him."

After the fourth commandment we find a fifth reference to the ancient law, followed by the fifth command:—

It has been said to you, Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy.² But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; (45) That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he makes his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and

¹ Matt. v. 38-42.

² See Levit. xix. 17, 18.

*on the unjust. (46) For if you love them that love you, what reward have you? do not even the publicans the same? (47) And if you salute your brethren only, what do you more than others? do not even the heathen so? Be therefore perfect, even as your Father who is in heaven is perfect."*¹

These verses I had formerly regarded as a continuation, an exposition, an enforcement, I might almost say an exaggeration, of the words, "*Resist not evil.*"

But as I had found a simple, precise, and practical meaning in each of the passages beginning with a reference to the ancient law, I anticipated a similar experience here. After each reference of this sort had thus far come a command, and each command had been important and distinct in meaning; it ought to be so now.

The closing words of the passage, repeated by Luke, which are to the effect that God makes no distinction of persons, but lavishes His gifts upon all, and that we ought to be like God in this respect, and not make distinctions between persons and ought not to do as the heathen do, but ought to love all men and to do good to all, — these words were clear; they seemed to me to be a confirmation and exposition of some definite law — but what this law was I could not for a long time understand.

To love one's enemies? — this was something impossible. It was one of those sublime thoughts that we must look upon only as an indication of an unattainable moral ideal. It was too much or nothing. We might, perhaps, refrain from doing injury to our enemies — but to love them! — impossible; Christ did not prescribe the impossible. And besides, in the most ancient words, in the reference to the ancient law, it was said: "*It has been said to you, Thou shalt hate thine enemy,*" there was cause for doubt. In other references Christ cited textually the terms of the Mosaic law; but here He introduces words which had never been said before. He seems to calumniate the law.

As with regard to my former doubts, so now the

¹ Matt. v. 43-48.

commentators gave me no explanation of the difficulty. They all agreed that the words "*hate thine enemy*" were not in the Mosaic law, but they offered no suggestion as to the meaning of the unauthorized phrase. They spoke of the difficulty of loving one's enemies, that is, wicked men (thus they emended Christ's words); and they said that while it is impossible to love our enemies, we may refrain from wishing them harm and from inflicting injury upon them. Moreover, they insinuated that we might and should "convince" our enemies, that is, resist them; they spoke of the different degrees of this kind of benevolence which we might attain—from all of which the final conclusion was that Christ, for some inexplicable reason, quoted as from the law of Moses words not to be found therein, and then uttered a number of sublime phrases which at bottom are impracticable and meaningless.

It seemed to me this could not be so. In this passage, as in the passages containing the first four commandments, there must be some clear and precise meaning. To find this meaning, I set myself first of all to discover the purport of the words containing the inexact reference to the ancient law: "*It has been said to you, Thou shalthate thine enemy.*" Christ had some reason for introducing each of His commands with words from the law, "*Do not kill, do not commit adultery,*" and the rest; they serve as the antitheses of His own teaching. If we do not understand what is meant by the citations from the ancient law, we cannot understand what He proscribed. The commentators say frankly (it is impossible not to say so) that He in this instance made use of words not to be found in the Mosaic law, but they do not tell us why He did so or what this unveracious reference means.

It seemed to me above all necessary to know what Christ meant by introducing words not to be found in the law, and I asked myself what these words inaccurately introduced by Christ from the law could mean. In all of Christ's other references to the law, only a single rule from the ancient law is cited: "*Thou shalt*

not kill" — "*Thou shalt not commit adultery*" — "*Thou shalt not forswear thyself*" — "*An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth*" — and taking each as a text He propounds His own.

Here He cites two contrasting rules: "*It has been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy,*" — from which it would appear that the contrast between these two rules of the ancient law, relative to one's neighbor and one's enemy, should be the basis of the new law.

To understand more clearly what this contrast was, I asked myself what is the meaning of the word "neighbor" and the word "enemy," as used in the Gospel text. After consulting lexicons and Biblical texts, I was convinced that "neighbor" in the Hebrew language invariably meant only a Hebrew. The same meaning of "neighbor" is expressed in the Gospel parable of the Samaritan. According to the notion of the Jewish scribe¹ who asked, "*And who is my neighbor?*" the Samaritan could not be his neighbor. The word "neighbor" is used with the same meaning in Acts vii. 27. "Neighbor," in Gospel language, means a compatriot, a person belonging to the same nationality. And so, having come to the conclusion that the antithesis used by Christ in the citation, "*love thy neighbor, hate thine enemy,*" must be in the distinction between the words "compatriot" and "foreigner," I asked myself what was the Jewish understanding of "enemy," and I found my supposition confirmed. The word "enemy" is nearly always employed in the Gospels in the sense, not of a personal enemy, but, in general, of a "hostile people."² The singular number in which the word "enemy" is used, in the phrase "*hate thine enemy,*" convinced me that the meaning is a "hostile people." In the Old Testament, the conception "hostile people" is nearly always expressed in the singular number.

As soon as I understood this, the difficulty immedi-

¹ Luke x. 29.

² Luke i. 71, 74; Matt. xxii. 44; Mark xii. 36; Luke xx. 43, etc.

ately resolved itself in this way: why and how could Christ, who had before quoted the authentic words of the law, here cite the words, "*It has been said to you, hate thine enemy,*" words which had not been said? We have only to understand the word "enemy" in the sense of "hostile people," and "neighbor" in the sense of "compatriot," and the difficulty is completely solved. Christ is speaking of the manner in which, according to the law of Moses, the Hebrews were directed to act toward "hostile peoples." The various passages scattered through the different books of the Old Testament, prescribing the oppression, slaughter, and extermination of other peoples, Jesus summed up in one word, "hate," to do evil to the enemy. And He says:—

"It has been said to you that you must love those of your own race, and hate foreigners; but I say unto you, Love every one without reference to the nationality to which they may belong."

When I had understood these words in this way, another principal difficulty was immediately done away with—how to understand the phrase, "*Love your enemies.*"

It is impossible to love one's personal enemies; but it is perfectly possible to love the citizens of a foreign nation equally with one's compatriots. And for me it became evident that in saying, "*It has been said, Love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies,*" Jesus is speaking of the fact that men are in the habit of looking upon compatriots as neighbors, and foreigners as enemies; and He commands them not to do this. He says: "According to the law of Moses there is a difference between the Hebrews and non-Hebrews—the national enemy; but I say unto you, Make no such distinction." And then, according to Matthew and Luke, after giving this command, He says that with God all men are equal, all are lighted by the same sun, on all falls the same rain. God makes no distinction among peoples, and lavishes His gifts on all men; men ought to act exactly in the same way toward one another, without distinction of national-

ity, and not like the heathen, who divide themselves into distinct nationalities.

Thus once more I found confirmed on all sides the simple, clear, important, and practical meaning of Christ's words. Once more, in place of a sentence from a cloudy and obscure philosophy, appeared a clear, precise, important, and practical rule. To make no distinction between compatriots and foreigners, and to abstain from all the results of such distinction, — from hostility toward foreigners, from war, from all participation in war, from all preparations for war; to establish with all men, of whatever nationality, the same relations granted to compatriots.

All this was so simple and so clear, that I was astonished that I had not perceived it from the first.

The cause of my error was the same as that which had perplexed me with regard to the passages relating to judgments and the taking of oaths. It is very difficult to understand that tribunals which are opened with Christian services by professed Christians, blest by those that consider themselves the guardians of Christ's law, could be incompatible with Christ's command; could be, in fact, diametrically opposed to it! It is still more difficult to believe that the very oath which we are obliged to take by the guardians of Christ's law, is directly repudiated by this law! To admit that everything in life that is considered essential and natural, as well as what is considered the most noble and grand, — love of country, its defence, its glory, battle with its enemies, and the rest, — to admit that all this is not only an infraction of Christ's law, but is directly denounced by Jesus, — this, I say, is awfully difficult.

Our life is now so far away from Christ's teaching that this very estrangement constitutes now the chief difficulty in understanding its meaning. We have been so deaf and so forgetful of all that He said to us about our lives — not only when He commands us not to kill, but when He warns us against anger, when He commands us not to resist evil, but to turn the other cheek, to love our enemies; we are so accustomed to speak

of a body of men especially organized for murder, as a Christian army, we are so accustomed to hear prayers addressed to Christ for the assurance of victory over our enemies, we have put our pride and glory in slaughter, we have made the sword, that symbol of murder, an almost sacred object (so that a man deprived of this symbol, of his sword, is a dishonored man); we are so accustomed, I say, to this, that now it seems to us that Christ did not forbid war, that if He had forbidden it, He would have said so more plainly.

We forget that Christ could never have foreseen that men having faith in His doctrine of humility, love, and universal brotherhood could, with calmness and premeditation, organize themselves for the murder of their brethren.

Christ could not have foreseen this, and so He could not forbid a Christian to participate in war, just as a father who exhorts his son to live honestly, never to wrong any person, and to give all that he has to others, would not forbid his son to cut people's throats on the highway.

None of the apostles, none of Christ's disciples during the first centuries of Christianity, could have realized the necessity of forbidding a Christian that form of murder which we call war.

Here, for example, is what Origen says in his reply to Celsus¹:—

"In the next place, Celsus urges us 'to help the king with all our might, and to labor with him in the maintenance of justice, to fight for him; and, if he requires it, to fight under him, or lead an army along with him.'

"To this, our answer is that we do, when occasion requires, give help to kings, and that, so to say, a divine help, 'putting on the whole armor of God.' And this we do in obedience to the injunction of the apostle, 'I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men, for kings, and for all that are in authority;' and the more any one excels in piety, the more effective

¹ "Contra Celsum," Book VIII., chap. lxxiii.

help does he render to kings, even more than is given by soldiers, who go forth to fight and slay as many of the enemy as they can.

“And to those enemies of our faith who require us to bear arms for the commonwealth, and to slay men, we can reply :—

“ ‘ Do not those who are priests at certain shrines, and those who attend on certain gods, as you account them, keep their hands free from blood, that they may, with hands unstained and free from human blood, offer the appointed sacrifices to your gods? and even when war is upon you, you never enlist the priests in the army. If that, then, is a laudable custom, how much more so, that while others are engaged in battle, these too should engage as the priests and ministers of God, keeping their hands pure, and wrestling in prayers to God on behalf of those who are fighting in a righteous cause, and for the king who reigns righteously, that whatever is opposed to those who act righteously may be destroyed ! ’ ”

And at the close of the chapter, in explaining that Christians, through their peaceful lives, are much more helpful to kings than soldiers are, Origen says :—

“ And none fight better for the emperor than we do. *We do not, indeed, fight under him, although he require it ; but we fight on his behalf, forming a special army, — an army of piety, — by offering our prayers to God.* ”

This is the way in which the Christians of the first centuries regarded war, and such was the language that their leaders addressed to the rulers of the earth at a period when martyrs perished by hundreds and by thousands for having confessed the Christian religion.

But now? Now there is no question as to whether a Christian may or may not go to war! All young men, brought up according to the doctrine of the Church called Christian, are obliged, at a specified date during every autumn, to report at the bureaus of conscription, and, under the guidance of their spiritual directors, deliberately to renounce Christ's law.

Not long ago there was a peasant who refused mili-

tary service on the plea that it was contrary to the Gospel. The doctors of the Church explained to the peasant his error; but, as the peasant had faith, not in them, but in Christ, he was thrown into prison, where he remained until he was ready to renounce the law of Christ! And all this happened eighteen hundred years after our God had laid down for us Christians the clear and definite command: "Do not consider men of other nations as enemies, but consider all men as brethren, and treat them as you treat compatriots; and therefore refrain not only from killing those who are called enemies, but love them and do them good."

When I had thus understood these simple and definite commands of Christ undistorted by commentaries, I asked myself:—

"What would be the result if the Christian world believed in them, not in the way of reading and chanting them for the glory of God, but of obeying them for the good of men? What would be the result if men believed in the observance of these commands at least as seriously as they believe in saying their prayers every day, in going to church every Sunday, in fasting every Friday, in preparing for the sacraments every year? What would be the result if the faith of men in these commands were as strong as their faith in the requirements of the Church?"

And then I saw in imagination a Christian society living according to these commands and educating the younger generation to follow their precepts. I tried to picture the results if we taught our children from infancy, not what we teach them now,—to maintain personal dignity, to uphold personal privileges against the encroachments of others (which we can never do without humiliating or offending others),—but to teach them that no man has a right to privileges, and can neither be above nor below any one else; that only he who tries to stand higher than others is below others and more ignominious; that there is no more contemptible condition for a man than when he is angry with another; that what may seem to me foolish and despicable in another

cannot justify me in anger against him or in enmity with him.

Instead of the whole arrangement of our social organization as it now is, from the show-cases of shops to theaters, novels, and women's finery meant to stimulate sensuous desire, — I tried to imagine the results if we taught our children by precept and by example that the reading of lascivious novels and attendance at theaters and balls are the vulgarest of all pastimes, and that every act having for its object the adornment of the body or its exposure is most low and disgusting.

Instead of our present arrangement of society whereby it is considered right and indispensable for a young man to be a libertine up to the time of his marriage, instead of a life which separates husbands and wives being considered most natural, instead of giving to women the legal right to practise the trade of prostitution, instead of countenancing and sanctioning divorce, — I imagined, instead of all this, we taught by words and actions that the state of celibacy, the solitary existence of a man properly endowed for, and who has not renounced, the sexual relation, is a monstrous and opprobrious wrong; and that the abandonment of wife by husband, or of husband by wife, for the sake of another, is not only an unnatural act, but also an act cruel and inhuman.

Instead of our entire existence being based on violence so that every one of our amusements is provided and maintained by force; so that each of us from childhood to old age is by turns victim and executioner, — I tried to picture the results if we taught by word and deed that vengeance is the lowest of animal feelings, that not only is violence debasing, but that it deprives us of true happiness; that the only joy of life is that not maintained by force; and that our greatest consideration ought to be bestowed, not upon those that accumulate riches to the injury of others, but upon those who best serve others and give most to them.

If instead of regarding it as noble and lawful for every man to take an oath of allegiance and to give his most precious possession, that is to say his whole life, to some

unknown person, — I tried to imagine what would be the result if we taught that the enlightened will of man is to the highest degree sacred, so that no one can give it up to any one else; and that if a man place himself at the disposition of any one, and promise by oath anything whatever, he renounces his rational manhood and outrages his most sacred right. I tried to imagine the results, if, instead of the national hatred with which we are inspired under the name of "love for fatherland"; if, in place of those laudations of murder which we call war, which from earliest childhood has been held up to us as the most brilliant achievement of men, we were taught, on the contrary, horror and contempt for all the means — military, diplomatic, and political — which serve to divide men; if we were educated to look upon the division of men into political states, and a diversity of codes and frontiers, as an indication of barbaric ignorance; and that to wage war, that is, to massacre foreigners, strangers to us, without any cause, is a most horrible crime, to be perpetrated only by a depraved and misguided man, who has fallen to the lowest level of the brute. I imagined all men coming to these convictions, and I asked myself what would be the result.

Up to this time I asked myself, What will be the results of Christ's teaching, as I understood it? and the involuntary reply was, Nothing. We shall all continue to pray, to partake of the sacraments, to believe in the redemption and salvation of ourselves and the world through Christ, — and yet hold that salvation will come, not by our efforts, but because the end of the world will come. At the appointed time Christ will appear in His glory to judge the quick and the dead, and the kingdom of heaven will be established independent of what our lives are.

Now Christ's teaching, as I understood it, had an entirely different meaning; the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth depended on us. The practice of Christ's teaching, propounded in the five commands, instituted this kingdom of God. The kingdom of God on earth consists in this, that all men should be at peace

with one another. Peace among men is the greatest blessing that men can attain on this earth. Thus the Hebrew prophets conceived of the rule of God. This ideal has been, and is, in every human heart. The prophets all brought to men the promise of peace. Christ's whole teaching has but one object, to establish peace — the kingdom of God — among men.

In the Sermon on the Mount, in the interview with Nicodemus, in the instructions given to His disciples, in all His teachings, He spoke only of this, of the things that divided men, that kept them from peace, that prevented them from entering into the Kingdom of God. All the parables are only a description of what the kingdom of heaven is, and they show us the only way of entering therein is to love our brethren, and to be at peace with all. John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, proclaimed that the kingdom of God was at hand, and declared that Christ was to bring it upon earth. Christ Himself said that His mission was to bring peace: —

*"Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world gives give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid."*¹

And the observance of His five commands will bring peace upon the earth. All five have but one object, — the establishment of peace among men. If men will only believe in Christ's teaching, and practise it, the reign of peace will come upon earth, — not that peace which is the work of man, partial, precarious, and at the mercy of chance; but the peace that is all-pervading, inviolable, and eternal.

The first command says: Be at peace with every one; consider none as foolish or unworthy. If peace is violated, then all our endeavors are to be employed in reestablishing it. Serving God is in the extinction of enmity among men.² We are to be reconciled without delay, that we may not lose that inner peace which is the true life. Everything is comprised in this command; but Christ knew the worldly temptations that prevent peace among men, and gives a second com-

¹ John xiv. 27.

² Matt. v. 22-24.

mand against the temptation of the sexual relations, so perilous to peace. Look not on the body as an instrument of lust; avoid in advance this temptation. Let each man have one wife, and each woman one husband, and one is never to forsake the other, under any pretext.¹

The second temptation is that of the oath, which draws men into sin; know beforehand that this is wrong, and give no such promises.²

The third temptation is that of vengeance, which we call human justice; this we are not to resort to under any pretext; we are to endure offenses, and never to return evil for evil.³

The fourth temptation is that arising from difference in nationalities, from hostility between peoples and states; know that all men are brothers, and children of the same Father, and disturb not the peace with any one in the name of national ends.⁴

If men abstain from practising any one of these commands, peace will be violated. Let men practise all these commands, and peace will be established upon earth. These commands exclude all evil from the lives of men. The practice of these five commands would realize the ideal of human life existing in every human heart. All men would be brothers, each would be at peace with others, enjoying all the blessings of earth to the limit of years accorded by the Creator. Men would beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, and then would come the kingdom of God,—that reign of peace foretold by all the prophets, which was foretold by John the Baptist as near at hand, and which Christ proclaimed in the words of Isaiah:—

“The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year

¹ Matt. v. 28–32.

³ Matt. v. 38–42.

² Matt. v. 34–37.

⁴ Matt. v. 43–48.

*of the Lord.*¹ *And he began to say unto them, To-day hath this Scripture been fulfilled in your ears."*²

The commands for peace given by Jesus, — those simple and clear commands, foreseeing all possibilities of discussion, and anticipating all objections, — these commands proclaimed the kingdom of God upon earth. Jesus, then, was, in truth, the Messiah. He fulfilled what had been promised. But we have not fulfilled the commands we must fulfil if the kingdom of God is to be established upon earth, — that kingdom which men in all ages have earnestly desired, and have sought for continually, all their days.

CHAPTER VII

WHY have men not done as Christ commanded them, and thus secured the greatest happiness within their reach, the happiness they have always longed for and still desire?

And from all sides I hear one and the same reply, although expressed in different words: "Christ's teaching is very beautiful, and it is true that if we practised it, the kingdom of God would be established on earth; but it is difficult, and consequently impracticable." Christ's teaching how men should live is divinely beautiful, and brings men happiness, but it is difficult for men to practise it. We repeat this, and hear it repeated so many, many times, that we do not observe the contradiction contained in these words.

It is the quality of human nature to do what is best. And any instruction about the life of men is only an instruction as to what is best for men. If men are shown what is best for them to do, how can they say that they would like to do what is best, but cannot? Men can not only do what is bad for them, but they cannot help doing what is best for them.

The reasonable activity of man, since man began, has been applied to finding what is best among the contra-

¹ Isaiah lxi. 1, 2.

² Luke iv. 18, 19, 21.

dictions with which the life of the individual man and of all men is filled.

Men fight for the soil, for objects which are necessary to them; then they arrive at the division of goods, and call this property; they find that this arrangement, although difficult to establish, is best, and they maintain ownership. Men fight for the possession of women, they abandon their children; then they find it is best for each to have his own family; and although it is difficult to sustain a family, they maintain the family, as they do ownership and many other things.

As soon as they discover that a thing is best, however difficult of attainment, men do it. What does it mean, then, when we say that Christ's teaching is beautiful, that a life according to Christ's teaching would be better than the life which men now lead, but that we cannot lead this better life because it is difficult?

If the word "difficult," used in this way, is to be understood in the sense that it is difficult to renounce the fleeting satisfaction of sensual desires that we may obtain a greater good, why do we not say that it is difficult to plow so that we may have bread, to plant apple trees that we may have apples? Every being endowed with even the slightest spice of reason knows that he must endure difficulties to procure any good. And yet we say that Christ's teaching is lovely, but impossible of practice, because it is difficult! Now it is difficult, because in following it we are obliged to deprive ourselves of many things of which we had never been deprived before. Have we never heard that it is far more to our advantage to endure difficulties and privations than to have no privations and always satisfy all our desires?

A man may be a beast and no one will reproach him for it, but a man cannot argue about his desire to be a beast. From the moment that he begins to reason, he is conscious of being endowed with reason, and this consciousness stimulates him to distinguish between the reasonable and the unreasonable. Reason does not prescribe; it only enlightens.

In searching for a door in the darkness, I kept bruising my hands and knees. A man came with a light, and I saw the door. I ought no longer to hit the wall when I see the door; much less ought I to affirm that I see the door, that it is best to go out through the door, but that I find it is difficult to do so, and that, consequently, I prefer to bruise my knees against the wall.

In this marvelous argument that the Christian teaching is beautiful, and gives the world true happiness, but that men are weak, men are sinful, they would like to do what is best but they do the worst, and so cannot do the best,—there is an evident misapprehension; there is something else besides defective reasoning; there must be also a fallacious idea. Only a fallacious idea that there is something where there is nothing, and nothing where there is something, could lead men to such a strange denial of the possibility of practising that which by their own avowal would be for their true welfare.

The fallacious idea which has reduced men to this condition is that which is called dogmatic Christian religion, as it is taught from childhood through the various catechisms, Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant, to all who profess the Christianity of the Church.

This religion, according to the definition of it given by its followers, consists in accepting as real that which does not exist—these are Paul's words,¹ and they are repeated in all the theologies and catechisms as the best definition of faith. It is this faith in the reality of what does not exist that has led men to make the strange affirmation that Christ's teaching is beautiful for men, but will not do for men. Here is an exact epitome of what this religion teaches:—

A personal God, eternally existing—one of three persons—decided to create a world of spirits. This God of goodness created the world of spirits for their happiness, but it so happened that one of the spirits became spontaneously wicked and therefore unhappy. A long time passed, and God created another world, a material world,

¹ Heb. ii. 2. Literally, "Faith is the *support* of the hoped for, the *conviction* of the unseen."—Tr.

created man for man's own happiness, created man happy, immortal, and sinless. The felicity of man consisted in the enjoyment of life without toil; his immortality was due to the promise that this life should last forever; his innocence was due to the fact that he knew not evil.

Man was beguiled in paradise by that spirit of the first creation who had become spontaneously wicked, and from that time dates the fall of man, who engendered other men fallen like himself, and from that time men began to undergo toil, sickness, suffering, death, the physical and moral struggle for existence; that is to say, the imaginary man preceding the fall became real, as we know him to be, as we have no right or reason to imagine him not to be. The state of man who toils, who suffers, who chooses the good and rejects evil, who dies, — this state, which is the real and only conceivable state, is not, according to the doctrine of this religion, the normal state of man, but a state which is unnatural and temporary.

Although this state, according to the doctrine, has lasted for all humanity since the expulsion of Adam from paradise, that is, from the commencement of the world until the birth of Christ, and has continued since Christ's birth under exactly the same conditions, the faithful are asked to believe that this is an abnormal and temporary state. According to this doctrine, the Son of God, the second person of the Trinity, who was Himself God, was sent by God into the world in the garb of humanity to rescue men from this temporary and abnormal state; to deliver them from the pains with which they had been stricken by this same God because of Adam's sin; and to restore them to their former normal state of felicity, — that is, to immortality, innocence, and idleness. Christ, the second person of the Trinity (according to this doctrine), by suffering death at the hands of man, atoned for Adam's sin, and put an end to that abnormal state which had lasted from the commencement of the world. And from that time onward, the men who have had faith in Christ have returned to the state of the first man in paradise; that is, have become immortal, innocent, and idle.

The doctrine does not concern itself too closely with the practical result of the redemption, in virtue of which the earth after Christ's coming ought to have become once more, at least for believers, everywhere fertile, without need of human toil; sickness ought to have ceased, and mothers have borne children without pain, — since it is difficult to assure even believers who are worn by excessive labor and broken down by suffering, that it is not hard to toil, and not painful to endure suffering.

But that portion of the doctrine which proclaims the abrogation of death and of sin is asserted with special emphasis. It is asserted that the dead continue to live. And as the dead cannot bear witness that they are dead or that they are living, just as a stone is unable to affirm that it either can or cannot speak, this absence of denial is admitted as a proof, and it is asserted that dead men are not dead. With still more solemnity and assurance it is affirmed that, since Christ's coming, the man who has faith in him is free from sin; that is, that since Christ's coming, it is no longer necessary that man should guide his life by reason, and choose what is best for himself. He has only to believe that Christ has redeemed him from sin and he then becomes sinless, that is, perfectly good. According to this doctrine, men ought to believe that reason is powerless, and that for this cause they are without sin, that is, cannot err.

A faithful believer ought to be convinced that, since Christ's coming, the earth brings forth without labor, that children are born without pain, that diseases no longer exist, and that death and sin, that is, error, are destroyed; in a word, that what is, is not, and what is not, is.

Such is the rigorously logical theory of Christian theology.

This doctrine, by itself, seems to be innocent. But deviations from truth are never inoffensive, and the significance of their consequences is in proportion to the importance of the subject of which the falsehood is spoken. And here the subject of which the falsehood is spoken is the whole life of man.

What this doctrine calls the true life, is a life of personal happiness, without sin, and eternal ; that is, a life which no one has ever known, and which does not exist. But the life that is, the only life we know, the life we live and all humanity lives and has lived, is, according to this doctrine, a degraded and evil life, a mere phantasmagoria of the happy life which is our due.

Of the struggle between animal instincts and reason, which takes place in the soul of every man and constitutes the essence of every man's life, this doctrine takes no account. This struggle became a reality which was accomplished in the person of Adam in paradise at the creation of the world. And the question, "Shall I or shall I not eat the apples which tempt me?" does not, according to this doctrine, exist for man. This question was decided, once for all, in the negative, by Adam in paradise. Adam sinned for me ; in other words, he did wrong, and all of us have fallen irretrievably ; and all our efforts to live by reason are vain and even impious. I am irreparably bad and I ought to know it. My salvation does not depend upon living by the light of reason, and, after distinguishing between good and evil, choosing the good ; no, Adam, once for all, sinned for me, and Christ, once for all, has atoned for the wrong committed by Adam ; and so I ought, as a looker-on, to mourn over the fall of Adam and rejoice at the redemption through Christ.

All the love for truth and goodness that is inherent in the heart of man, all his efforts to illuminate his spiritual life by the light of reason, all my spiritual life, are not only of slight importance, according to this doctrine, they are a temptation, an incitement to pride.

Life as it is on this earth, with all its joys and its splendors, with all its struggles of reason with darkness, — the life of all men that have lived before me, my own life with its inner struggles and triumphs, — all this is not the true life ; it is the fallen life, a life irretrievably bad. The true life, the life without sin, is only in faith, that is, in imagination, that is, in lunacy !

Let any one break the habit contracted from infancy

of believing in all this ; let him look boldly at this doctrine as it is ; let him endeavor to put himself in the position of a man without prejudice, educated independently of this doctrine, — and then let him ask himself how this doctrine would appear to such a man ! It would seem absolute insanity.

Strange and shocking as all this appeared to me, I was obliged to examine into it, for here alone I found the explanation of the objection, so devoid of logic and common sense, that I heard everywhere with regard to the impossibility of practising Christ's teaching : *It is admirable, and would give true happiness to men, but men cannot obey it.*

Only a conviction that reality does not exist, and that the non-existent is real, could lead men to this surprising contradiction. And this false conviction I found in the pseudo-Christian religion which men had been teaching for fifteen hundred years.

The objection that Christ's teaching is excellent but impracticable comes not only from believers, but from skeptics, from those who do not believe, or think that they do not believe, in the dogmas of the fall of man and the redemption. The objection to Christ's teaching that it is impracticable is raised by men of science and philosophers, and in general by men who consider themselves free from all prejudice. They believe, or imagine that they believe, in nothing, and so consider themselves as above such a superstition as the dogma of the fall and the redemption.

It seemed so to me also at first. It seemed to me also that these learned men had serious motives for denying the practicability of Christ's teaching. But when I came to look deeper into the sources of their negation, I was convinced that the skeptics also have a false conception of life ; to them life is not what it is, but what they imagine it ought to be, — and this conception rests on the same foundation as does that of the believers. Professing themselves unbelievers, it is true they do believe in God or in Christ or in Adam ; but they believe in a fundamental idea which is at the basis of their misconcep-

tion,—in the rights of man to a life of happiness,—much more firmly than do the theologians.

However privileged science and philosophy boast of their claim to be the arbiters of the human mind, they are not its arbiters, but only its servants. Religion has provided a conception of life, and science travels in the beaten path. Religion reveals the meaning of the life of men, and science only applies this meaning to the different sides of life. And so, if religion gives a false meaning to human life, science, which builds upon this religious philosophy, can only apply this false notion under varying circumstances to the life of man. And this is what has happened with our European-Christian scientific philosophy.

The doctrine of the Church gave a fundamental meaning to the life of men in that man has a right to happiness, and this happiness is not attained by his own efforts, but by something external; and this conception has become the base of all our science and philosophy.

Religion, science, and public opinion, all, with one voice, tell us that the life we now lead is bad, and at the same time they affirm that the doctrine which teaches us how we can become better, and thus succeed in ameliorating life, is impracticable.

Religion says that Christ's teaching, which provides a reasonable method for the improvement of life by our own efforts, is impracticable because Adam fell, and the world was plunged into sin.

Our philosophy says that Christ's teaching is impracticable because human life is developed according to laws independent of the human will. Philosophy and all science, only in other words, say exactly the same as religion says in the dogmas of original sin and the redemption.

There are two fundamental theses at the basis of the doctrine of the redemption: (1) the normal life of man is a life of happiness, but our life on earth is one of misery, and it can never be bettered by man's efforts; (2) our salvation from this life is in faith.

These two theses are the source of the religious con-

ceptions of the believers and the non-believers of our pseudo-Christian society. The second thesis gave birth to the Church and its organization; from the first is derived the received tenets of public opinion and our political and philosophical theories.

All the political and philosophical theories that seek to justify the existing order of things — such as Hegelianism and its offshoots — grow out of this thesis.

Pessimism, which demands of life what it cannot give and therefore denies the value of life, has here also its origin.

Materialism, with its strange and enthusiastic affirmation that man is a development and nothing more, is the legitimate offspring of the doctrine that teaches that life here is a fallen existence.

Spiritism, with its learned adherents, is the best proof we have that the conclusions of philosophy and science are not free, but are based on the religious doctrine of that eternal happiness which should be the natural heritage of man.

This false conception of life has had a deplorable influence on all reasonable human activity. The dogma of the fall and the redemption of man has debarred man from the most important and legitimate field for the exercise of his powers, and has deprived him entirely of the idea that he can of himself do anything to make his life happier or better. Science and philosophy, proudly believing themselves hostile to pseudo-Christianity, only carry out its decrees. Science and philosophy concern themselves with everything except the theory that man can do anything to make himself better or happier. What is called "ethics" — moral instruction — has entirely disappeared from our pseudo-Christian society.

Believers and non-believers do not concern themselves in the least with the problem how we ought to live, how to make use of the reason with which we are endowed, but they ask:—

"Why is our earthly life not what we imagine it ought to be, and when will it become what we wish?"

Thanks only to this false doctrine which has pene-

trated into the very blood and marrow of our generations, there has arisen the surprising phenomenon that man, as it were, spit out the apple of the knowledge of good and evil, which according to the tradition he ate in paradise, and forgetting that the whole history of man is only a solution of the contradictions between animal instincts and reason, he began to employ his reason in discovering the historical laws that govern his animal nature.

Excepting the philosophical doctrines of the pseudo-Christian world, all the philosophical and religious doctrines of all nations, as far as we know them, — Judaism, the doctrine of Confucianism, Buddhism, Brahmanism, the wisdom of the Greeks, — all aim to regulate human life, and to enlighten men with regard to what each must do to be and to live better. The whole doctrine of Confucius teaches the perfecting of the individual; Judaism, the personal fidelity of every man to an alliance with God; Buddhism, how every man may escape from the evil of life; Socrates taught the perfecting of the individual through reason; the Stoics recognized the independence of reason as the sole basis of the true life.

The reasonable activity of man has always been — it could not be otherwise — to light by the torch of reason his progress toward beatitude. Our philosophy tells us that free-will is an illusion, and then boasts of the boldness of such a declaration. Free-will is not only an illusion; it is a word which has no sense. This word was invented by theologians and experts in criminal law; to refute it is to battle with windmills.

But reason, which illuminates our life and impels us to modify our actions, is not an illusion, and its authority can never be denied. To obey reason in the pursuit of good is the substance of the teachings of all the masters of humanity, and it is the substance of Christ's teaching; it is reason itself, and we cannot deny reason by the use of reason.

Christ's teaching is the teaching about the "son of man," common to all men; in other words, the teaching

about the reason common to all men, which illumines man in this endeavor.¹

Christ's teaching about the "son of man" being the son of God is the basis of all the Gospels, but finds its most complete expression in the interview with Nicodemus. Every man, Christ says, aside from his consciousness of his material, individual life proceeding from his father and his birth in the flesh from his mother's womb, has also a consciousness of a spiritual birth,² of an inner liberty, of something within; this comes from on high, from the infinite that we call God;³ now it is this inner consciousness born of God, the son of God in man, that we must possess and nourish if we would possess true life. The son of man is the son of God with a similar nature (but not the only son).

Whoever elevates within himself this son of God above everything else, whoever believes that life is in this only, will not be at variance with life. Variance from life proceeds only from this, that men do not believe in this light which is within them, the light of which John speaks when he says that "*life is in it; and the life is the light of men.*"

Christ teaches us to lift above everything the son of man, who is the Son of God, and the light of men.

He says, "When you have lifted up (exalted, magnified) the son of man, you will then know that I do not speak of myself personally."⁴ The Hebrews did not understand His teachings, and asked, "Who is this son of man we must exalt?"⁵ And to this question He answers:—

¹ Count Tolstol seems to mean that all men have an impulse toward good and toward reason which leads to good. He says in a parenthetical note:—

(It is superfluous to prove that "son of man" signifies son of man. To understand by the words "son of man" anything different from what they signify is to assume that Jesus, to say what He wished to say, intentionally made use of words which have an entirely different meaning. But even if, as the Church says, "son of man" means "Son of God," the phrase "son of man" means also man existent, for Christ Himself called all men "the sons of God.")

² John iii. 5, 6, 7.

⁴ John xii. 49.

³ John iii. 14-17.

⁵ John xii. 34.

*"Yet a little while is the light in you.¹ Walk while you have the light, lest darkness come upon you: for he that walks in darkness knows not whither he goes."*²

To the question, What signifies 'exalt the son of man,' Christ replies: To live in the light that is in men.

The son of man, according to Christ's answer, is the light in which men ought to walk, while the light is in them to illuminate their lives.

*"Take heed therefore, that the light which is in thee be not darkness.³ If the light which is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!"*⁴ he says in His instructions to all men.

Before Christ and since Christ men have said the same thing: that in man is a divine light descended from heaven, and that this light is reason, which alone should be the object of our worship, since it alone can show the way to true well-being.

This has been said by the Brahmins, by the Hebrew prophets, by Confucius, by Socrates, by Marcus Aurelius, by Epictetus, and by all the true sages, — not by compilers of philosophical theories, but by men who sought goodness for themselves and for all men.⁵

And yet we declare, in accordance with the dogma of the redemption, that it is entirely superfluous to think

¹ In all the translations authorized by the Church, we find here a perhaps intentional error. The words *ἐν ὑμῖν*, *in you*, are invariably rendered *with you*. — AUTHOR'S NOTE.

² John xii. 35.

³ Luke xi. 35.

⁴ Matt. vi. 23.

⁵ Marcus Aurelius says: "Reverence that which is best in the universe; and this is that which makes use of all things and directs all things. And in like manner also reverence that which is best in thyself; and this is of the same kind as that. For in thyself, also, that which makes use of everything else, is this, and thy life is directed by this." ("Meditations," v. 21.)

Epictetus says: "From God have descended the seeds not only to my father and grandfather, but to all beings which are generated on the earth and are produced, and particularly to rational beings; for these only are by their nature formed to have communion with God, being by means of reason conjoined with Him." ("Discourses," chap. ix.)

Confucius says: "The law of the great learning consists in developing and reestablishing the luminous principle of reason which we have received from on high." This sentence is repeated many times, and constitutes the basis of Confucius's doctrine. — AUTHOR'S NOTE.

of the light that is in us, and that we ought not to speak of it at all!

We must, say the believers, study the three persons of the Trinity; we must know the nature of each of these persons, and what sacraments we ought or ought not to perform, for the salvation of men depends, not on our own efforts, but on the Trinity and the regular performance of the sacraments.

We must, say the non-believers, know the laws by which this infinitesimal particle of matter was evolved in infinite space and infinite time; but it is absurd to believe that by reason alone we can secure true well-being, because the amelioration of man's condition does not depend on man himself, but on the general laws we shall discover.

I firmly believe that, a few centuries hence, the history of what we call the scientific activity of this age will be a prolific subject for the hilarity and pity of future generations. For several centuries, they will say, the scholars of the small Western portion of a great continent were the victims of epidemic insanity; they imagined themselves to be the possessors of a life of eternal beatitude, and they busied themselves with divers lucubrations in which they sought to determine in what way this life could be realized, without doing anything themselves, or even concerning themselves with what they ought to do to ameliorate their actual life. And, what to the future historian will seem much more melancholy, it will be found that this group of men had once had a master who had taught them a number of simple and clear rules, pointing out what they must do to render their lives happy,—and that the words of this master had been construed by some to mean that he would come on a cloud to reorganize human society, and by others as admirable, but impracticable, since human life was not what they wished it to be, and consequently was not worthy of consideration; while human reason was obliged to concern itself with the study of the laws of this life, without any relation to the welfare of man.

•

The Church says Christ's teaching is impracticable, because life here is only a shadow of the true life. It cannot be good, it is all evil. The best way of living this life is to scorn it and to live by faith (that is, by imagination) in a happy and eternal life to come, and to live here as we do live, and to pray.

Philosophy, science, and public opinion say:—

"Christ's teaching is impracticable because the life of man does not depend on the light of reason with which he can illumine life itself, but on general laws; hence it is useless to illumine this life with reason and to live conformably with it; but we must live as we can with the firm conviction that according to the laws of historical and sociological progress, after having lived badly for a very long time, we shall suddenly find that our lives have become very good."

Once there was a farm to which men came; they found there all that was necessary to sustain life,—a house well furnished, barns filled with grain, cellars and storerooms well stocked with provisions, implements of husbandry, horses, sheep, and cattle,—in a word, all that was needed for a life of comfort and ease. Men came from all directions to this farm and began to profit by all they found there, but each for himself, without thinking of others, or of those who might follow. Each wanted the whole for himself, and hastened to seize on all that he could possibly grasp. Then began a veritable pillage; they fought for the possession of the spoils; they slaughtered the milch cow and the unshorn sheep for their flesh; they warmed their stoves with wagons and other implements; they fought for the milk and grain; they wasted and spoiled more than they could use.

No one could eat a morsel in peace. They snapped and snarled at one another; then some one stronger would come and take away the spoils already secured, to surrender them in turn to some one else.

All these people left the farm, exhausted, bruised, and famished.

Thereupon the Master put everything to rights again,

and arranged matters so that men might live there in peace. The farm again became a treasury of abundance. Then came another group of seekers, and the same struggle and tumult was repeated, till these in their turn went away bruised and angry, cursing their comrades and the Master for providing so little and so ill. Still the good Master reorganized the farm so that men might live on it, and again it was the same, and again and again and again!

And here there is found, among the newcomers, a teacher who said to his companions:—

“Brothers, we are not doing the right thing! see how abundantly everything on the farm is supplied, how well everything is arranged! There is enough here for us and for those who will come after us; only let us live in a reasonable manner. Let us not take from one another, but let us help one another. Let us work, plant, care for the dumb animals, and every one will be satisfied.”

And it came to pass that some of the company understood what the teacher said; they ceased fighting and robbing one another, and began to work.

But others, who had not heard the teacher's words and distrusted him, did not follow his counsels, but continued to fight as before and to ruin the Master's goods, and then went on their way. Others came, and the same state of things went on. Those who followed the teacher's counsels said to those about them:—

“Cease fighting; do not waste the Master's goods; you will be better off for doing so; do as the teacher says.” Still there were many who would not hear and would not believe, and matters went on very much as they did before.

All this was natural, and continued as long as people did not believe what the teacher said. But they tell us the time came when every one on the farm had heard and understood the teacher's words, and realized that God spoke through His lips, and that the teacher Himself was none other than God in person; and all had faith in His words as divine. But they tell

us, that even after that, instead of living according to the teacher's advice, each still struggled for his own, and they went on slaying one another, saying : —

"Now we know for a certainty that it must be so and cannot be otherwise."

What does this all mean? There are the cattle — even they live in peace when there is fair grazing for them, so as not to destroy it idly; but men with knowledge, who have learned how they ought to live, who are convinced that God Himself has shown them how to live the true life, follow still their evil ways, because they say, "It is impossible to live otherwise."

These men have imagined something else! Now what have these men at the farm had in mind, if, after having heard the teacher's words, they have continued to live as before, snatching the bread from one another's mouths, fighting, and destroying all that was good and themselves as well? This is what : —

The teacher said to them, "Your life on this farm is bad; live better and your life will become good."

But they imagined that the teacher had condemned their life on the farm, and had promised them another and a better life, not on this farm, but somewhere else. They decided that the farm was only a temporary abiding-place,¹ and that it was not worth while to try to live well there; the important thing was not to be cheated out of the other life promised them elsewhere.

This is the only way in which we can explain the strange conduct of the people on the farm, of whom some believed that the teacher was God, and others that he was a wise man and his words were true, but all continued to live as before in defiance of the teacher's words.

These men heard everything, they understood everything, but they let the one significant truth in the wise man's teachings go in at one ear and out the other, — that they must work out for themselves their own peace and happiness there on the farm, to which they have

¹ *Dvor postoyalui*, an inn. The word translated farm throughout is *dvor*, meaning any residence with the yard and outbuildings.

come, while they imagined that this farm was only a temporary abiding-place, and beyond would be their eternal home.

Here is the origin of the strange declaration that the teacher's precepts were beautiful, even divine, but that they were difficult to practise.

If men would only cease from ruining themselves while waiting for some one to come and aid them: Christ on the clouds with the voice of a trumpet, or an historical law of the differentiation or integration of forces.

No one will come to their aid if they do not aid themselves. And it is easy for them to aid themselves. Only let them expect nothing from heaven or from earth, and cease ruining themselves.

CHAPTER VIII

LET us suppose that Christ's teaching gives the world happiness, that it is reasonable, and that man on the score of reason has no right to reject it, what can a single follower of that teaching do in the midst of a world of men who do not fulfil Christ's law? If all men would suddenly decide to fulfil Christ's teaching, then its practice would be possible. But one man alone cannot go against the whole world. "If, among the world of men who do not practise Christ's teaching," it is commonly said, "I alone obey it; if I give away all that I possess; if I turn the other cheek; if I refuse to take an oath or to go to war, I shall be arrested; if I do not die of hunger, I shall be flogged to death; if I am not flogged, I shall be cast into prison or shot, and all the happiness of my life — my life itself — will be sacrificed in vain."

This plea is founded on the same misunderstanding as forms the basis of all objections to the practicability of Christ's teaching.

This is what is generally said and what I myself thought until I freed myself entirely from the Church

dogmas which prevented me from understanding the true significance of Christ's teaching about life.

Christ lays down His teaching about life as a means of salvation from the ruinous life lived by men who do not follow His teaching; and suddenly I declare that I should be very glad to follow His teaching but I fear I may ruin my life! Christ teaches salvation from a ruined life, and I cling to this ruined life! Hence it follows I do not consider this life of mine a ruined life, I consider it a good and profitable possession, something real. In this recognition of my personal worldly life as something real and good and belonging to me lies the misunderstanding that prevented me from comprehending Christ's teaching. Christ knew men's unfortunate tendency to regard their personal, worldly life as real and good, and so, in a series of sermons and parables, He taught them that they had no right to life, that they had no life until they obtain the true life by renouncing the phantom of life which they call their life.

To understand Christ's teaching about "saving" one's life, we must first understand what all the prophets said, what Solomon said, what Buddha said, what all the wise men of the world have said, about the personal life of man. We may, to use Pascal's expression, put it out of our thoughts and carry always before us a screen to conceal the abyss of death, toward which we keep hastening; but it suffices to reflect on the individual personal life of man, to be convinced that this life, in so far as it is personal, is not only of no account to each separately, but that it is a cruel jest to the heart, to the reason, of every man, and to all that is good in every man. And therefore to understand Christ's teaching we must, first of all, return to ourselves, reflect soberly, undergo the *μετάνοια* of which John the Baptist, Christ's predecessor, speaks, when addressing himself to men led astray like ourselves. He said:—

"First of all, repent;" in other words, "Reflect, or you will all perish." He said: *"The axe is already laid unto the root of the tree to cut it down. Death and perdition await each one of you. Forget not this, repent!"* Re-

flect. And Christ at the beginning of His career as a preacher also declared, "*Repent, or else you will all perish.*"

When Christ was told of the death of the Galileans massacred by Pilate, He said:—

*"Do you suppose these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they suffered such things? I tell you, No: but except you repent, you shall all likewise perish. Or those eighteen on whom the tower in Siloam fell, and slew them, do you suppose they were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you, No: but except you repent, you will all likewise perish."*¹

If He had lived in our day, in Russia, He would have said: "Think you that those that were burnt to death in the circus at Berditchevo² or that were killed in the railway accident on the embankment of Kukuyevo were sinners above all others? I tell you, No; but you, if you do not repent, if you do not arouse yourselves, if you do not find in your life that which is imperishable, you also will perish. You are horrified by the death of those crushed by the tower, burned in the circus; but lo! your death, equally frightful and inevitable, is here, before you. You strive in vain to forget it; when it comes unexpectedly, it will be only the more horrible."

He said:—

*"When you see a cloud rise out of the west, straightway you say, There comes a shower; and so it is. And when the south wind blows you say, There will be heat; and it comes to pass. You hypocrites, you can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that you do not discern this time? And why, even of yourselves, do you judge not what is right?"*³

You are able by signs to predict what the weather will be; why, then, do you not see what is before you? Flee from danger, guard your material life as much as you wish, nevertheless, though Pilate may not massacre

¹ Luke xiii. 1-5.

² This refers to a wooden building built for public amusement during carnival time in 1883. It caught fire; the doors could not be opened, and nearly all within were burned to death.—ED.

³ Luke xii. 54-57.

you, a tower may fall on you, but if Pilate or the tower spare you, then you will die in your bed, amidst much greater suffering.

Make a simple calculation, as do worldly-minded men who undertake any enterprise whatever, such as building a house, going to war, or establishing a factory. They contrive and labor with the hope of seeing their calculations realized.

*"For who of you intending to build a tower does not first sit down and count the cost whether he have sufficient to finish it? Lest haply, after he has laid the foundation, and is not able to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him, saying, This man began to build, and was not able to finish. Or what king, going to make war against another king, does not first sit down and consult whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that comes against him with twenty thousand?"*¹

Is it not senseless to labor at what, however much you try, can never be finished? Death will always come before the tower of your worldly prosperity can be completed. And if you know beforehand that, however you may struggle with death, not you, but death, will triumph; is it not an indication that we ought not to struggle with death, or to set our hearts on that which will surely perish, but to seek that which cannot be destroyed by our inevitable death?

*"And he said unto his disciples, Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life what you shall eat; neither for the body, what you shall put on. The soul is more than meat and the body is more than raiment. Consider the ravens: for they neither sow nor reap; which neither have storehouse nor barn; and God feeds them: How much more are you better than the fowls? And who of you with taking thought can add to his stature one cubit? If you then are not able to do that which is least, why take you thought for the rest? Consider the lilies how they grow: they toil not, they spin not; and yet I say unto you that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these."*²

¹ Luke xiv. 28-31.

² Luke xii. 22-27.

Whatever pains we may take for our nourishment, for the care of the body, we cannot prolong life by a single hour.¹ Is it not folly to trouble ourselves about a thing that we cannot possibly accomplish? You know very well that your material life will end with death, and you take pains to guarantee your life by possessions. Life cannot be guaranteed by property. Understand that this is a ridiculous deception, whereby you only delude yourselves. The significance of life, says Christ, cannot be in what you possess or in what you can accumulate, in what is not yourselves. It must be in something entirely different. He says the life of man, in all its abundance, does not depend on his possessions.

"The ground of a certain rich man," He says, *"brought forth plentifully: And he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said to him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided? So is he that lays up treasure for himself, and is not rich in God."*²

Death always, at every moment, threatens him. Christ says:—

"Let your loins be girded about, and your lamps burning; and you yourselves like men who wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he comes and knocks they may open to him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he comes shall find watching;.... And if he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants. And this know, that if the goodman of the house had known what hour the

¹ The words of verse 25 are incorrectly translated; the word *ἡλικίαν* means *age, age of life*; consequently the whole phrase should be rendered *can add one hour to his life.*—AUTHOR'S NOTE.

² Luke xii. 16-21.

*thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. Be therefore ready also: for the son of man comes at an hour when ye think not."*¹

The parable of the virgins waiting for the bridegroom, that of the consummation of the age, and the last judgment, all these places, as the commentators all agree, besides their secondary meaning of the end of the world, are designed to teach that death awaits us at every moment.

Death, death, death, awaits you at every second. Life is passed in sight of death. If you labor for yourselves alone, for your personal future, you know that in the future one thing awaits you, death. And death will destroy all that you have been working for. Consequently, life for itself can have no meaning. If it is a reasonable life, then it must be something else; in other words, it must be a life the object of which is not in a life for itself in the future. The reasonable life consists in living in such a way that life cannot be destroyed by death.

*"Martha, Martha, thou art troubled about many things, but only one thing is needful."*² All the numberless actions which we perform for ourselves in the future will not be necessary for us; it is all a delusion with which we deceive ourselves; one thing only is needful.

From the day of his birth, man is so placed that he is threatened with inevitable ruin, that is a senseless life, and a senseless death, if he does not discover the one thing essential to the true life. This one thing which insures the true life Christ reveals to men. He does not invent this, He promises nothing through His own divine power; He simply reveals to men that, together with this personal life, which is an undoubted delusion, must be that which is the truth and not delusion.

In the parable of the husbandmen³ Christ explains the cause of that blindness in men which conceals the truth

¹ Luke xii. 35-40.

² Luke x. 41.

³ Matt. xxi. 33-42.

from them, and which impels them to take the apparent for the real, their personal life for the true life.

Men, living in a proprietor's cultivated garden, imagined that they were its owners. And from that erroneous fancy springs a series of foolish and cruel actions, which ends in their expulsion, their exclusion from life. Exactly so we have imagined that the life of each one of us is his own personal property, that we have the right to enjoy it as we wish, without recognizing any obligation to others.

And for us who imagine this there must inevitably be a similar series of senseless and cruel actions followed by exclusion from life. And as the husbandmen killed the householder's messengers and son, thinking that the more cruel they were the better able they would be to gain their ends, so we imagine that we shall obtain the greatest security by means of violence.

As the inevitable end for the husbandmen for not having given any one the fruits of the garden is that the proprietor will drive them out, in exactly the same way will the end be for men who imagine that the personal life is the true life. Death will expel them from life, replacing them by others, not as a punishment, but simply because these men have misconceived the meaning of life. Exactly as the residents of the garden either forgot, or did not wish to remember, that they had received a garden already hedged about and provided with a driven well, and that some one had labored for them and expected them to labor in their turn for others; so men who would live for themselves have forgotten and wish to forget all that has been done for them before they were born, and is done for them all the days of their lives, and that therefore something is expected of them. They wish to forget that all the blessings of life which they enjoy have been given to them and are given to them, and therefore ought to be shared with others.

This correction of our view of life, this *μετάνοια*, or repentance, is the corner-stone of Christ's teaching. According to Christ's teaching, just as the vine-dressers

living in the vineyard which had not been cultivated by them should have understood and felt that they owed an unpaid debt to the master ; so should men understand and feel that from the day of their birth to the day of their death they owe an unpaid debt to those that lived before them, and to those that are living now, and to those that are to live henceforth, as well as to Him that was and is and is to be the end of all. They ought to understand that every hour of their life during the time of which they do not cut this kind of life short, they increase this obligation, and that a man, therefore, who lives for himself, and denies this obligation connecting him with life and its first principle, deprives himself of life, and so forfeits life. He should remember that in living thus, striving to save his own life, his personal life, he ruins it, as Christ so many times said.

The only true life is the life that continues the past life, that promotes the happiness of the present and the happiness of the future. To take part in this true life, man should renounce his personal will so as to fulfil the will of the Father of Life who gave it to the son of man.

The slave that performs his own will and not his master's will shall not dwell forever in the master's house, says Christ, expressing the same thought in another place ;¹ only the son who observes the will of the father shall have eternal life.

Now, the will of the Father of Life is the life, not of an individual man, but of the only son of man living among men ; and so a man saves his life when he looks on his life as a pledge, as the talent confided to him by the Father for the profit of all, when he lives not for himself, but for the son of man.

A master gave each of his slaves a certain proportion of his property, and, without saying anything to them, left them to themselves. Some of the slaves, though they had not received explicit directions from their master how to employ their part of the lord's property, understood that the property was not theirs, but still belonged to the master, and that it ought to increase,

¹ John viii. 35.

and they labored for their master. And the servants who had labored for the master became partakers in the master's life, while the others, who had not so labored, were despoiled even of what they had received.¹

The life of the son of man has been given to all men, and they have not been told why it was given to them. Some men understand that life is not for their personal use, but was given them as a gift, that they must use it for the good of the son of man, and thus live ; others, feigning not to understand the true object of life, refuse to serve life : and those that labor for the true life will be united with the source of life ; those that do not so labor will lose the life they already have. And here, from verse thirty-one to forty-six, Christ tells us in what the service of the son of man consists and what will be the recompense of that service. The son of man, according to Christ's expression, like a king, will say : —

"Come you blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom because you have fed me, given me drink, clothed and received me, because I am the same in you and in the smallest of those whom you have pitied and benefited. You have not lived the personal life, but the life of the son of man, and therefore you have the life eternal."

According to all the Gospels, Christ teaches nothing else but this life eternal ; and, strange as it may seem to say this of Christ, Christ, who arose again in person, and promised that all should rise again, — Christ not only said nothing in affirmation of individual resurrection and individual immortality beyond the grave, but even attributed to that restoration of the dead in the kingdom of the Messiah conjectured by the Pharisees a significance which allowed no such notion as a personal resurrection.

The Sadducees controverted the restoration of the dead. The Pharisees accepted it just as the orthodox Hebrews accept it now. According to the idea of the Hebrews, the restoration of the dead — but not the resurrection, as this word is incorrectly rendered — is to be accomplished at the time of the coming of the age of the

¹ Matt. xxv. 14-46.

Messiah and the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth. And here Christ, meeting with this superstition of a temporal, local, and physical resurrection, denies it, and in its place establishes His teaching concerning the restoration of the eternal life in God.¹

When the Sadducees, who denied the restoration of the dead, supposing that Christ believed with the Pharisees in the resurrection, asked Him to which of the seven brethren the woman should belong, He replied with clearness and precision concerning this and the other idea. He said:² "*You err, knowing neither the Scriptures nor the power of God.*" And refuting the argument of the Pharisees, He said: The restoration from the dead will be neither physical nor personal. Those that attain restoration from the dead, He said, will become the sons of God, and will live like the angels—the sons of God—in heaven, that is, with God; and such personal questions as "whose wife will she be," cannot exist for them because they, united with God, cease to be persons.

Touching the restoration of the dead He said, replying to the Sadducees, who recognized one earthly life and nothing besides an earthly life in the flesh:—

*"Have you not read what was said to you by God? In the Scriptures it says that in the bush God spoke to Moses, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob."*³ If God said to Moses

¹ The following sentences appear in the French translation, apparently from another manuscript from that used in the Elpidin edition:—

[Every time that Christ met with this superstition (introduced at this period into the Talmud, and of which there is not a trace in the records of the Hebrew prophets), He did not fail to deny its truth. The Pharisees and the Sadducees were constantly discussing the subject of the resurrection of the dead. The Pharisees believed in the resurrection of the dead, in angels, and in spirits (Acts xxiii. 8), but the Sadducees did not believe in resurrection, or angel, or spirit. We do not know the source of the difference in belief, but it is certain that it was one of the polemical subjects among the secondary questions of the Hebraic doctrine that were constantly under discussion in the synagogues. And Christ not only did not recognize the resurrection, but denied it every time He met with the idea.]

² Matt. xxii. 29–32; Mark xii. 24–27; Luke xx. 34–38.

³ Ex. iii. 6.

that He was the God of Jacob, then Jacob is not dead for God, because "*He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living. For God all are living.*"¹ And so if there is a living God, then also that man is living who has entered into community with the eternally living God.

Against the Pharisees Christ said that the restoration of life could not be physical and personal. Against the Sadducees He said that, apart from the personal and temporal life, there is still another life in union with God.

While Christ denies the personal resurrection in the flesh, He acknowledges the restoration of life in this sense, that man transfers his life to God. Christ teaches salvation from a personal life, and places this salvation in the exaltation of the son of man and life in God. Combining this teaching of His with the teaching of the Hebrews concerning the coming of the Messiah, He speaks to the Hebrews about the restoration of the son of man from the dead, meaning by this, not the physical and personal restoration of the dead, but the awakening of life in God. Of the personal resurrection in the flesh He never speaks. The best proof that Christ never preached the resurrection of men is given by the only two passages which theologians adduce as proofs that He taught the doctrine of the resurrection. These two passages are as follows: Matt. xxv. 31-46, and John v. 28, 29. In the first He is speaking of the coming, that is, the restoration, the exaltation, of the son of man — just exactly as it says in Matthew x. 23; and then the greatness and power of the son of man are compared to a king's. In the second place it speaks of the restoration of the true life here on earth, as this is expressed also in the twenty-fourth verse preceding.

It only requires to reflect on the meaning of Christ's teaching about the eternal life in God, it requires to reëstablish in one's imagination the teaching of the Hebrew prophets, to understand that if Christ had wished to promulgate the teaching about the resurrec-

¹ Mark xii. 26, 27.

tion of the dead, which was at that time only just beginning to get into the Talmud and becoming an object of controversy, then He would have clearly and definitely made this His teaching.

On the contrary, He not only did not do this, but even disclaimed it, and in all the Gospels it is impossible to find a single passage which would support this teaching. And the passages adduced above signify something entirely different. Strange as it may appear to those who have never carefully studied the Gospels for themselves, Christ said nothing whatever about His personal resurrection.

If, as the theologians teach, the foundation of the Christian faith is Christ's resurrection, it would seem the least thing to be desired that Christ, knowing that He was to rise again, knowing that in this would consist the principal dogma of faith in Him, should speak of the matter at least once, in clear and precise terms. Now, according to the canonical Gospels, He not only did not speak of it in clear and precise terms, He did not speak of it at all, not once, not a single word.

Christ's teaching consisted in the elevation of the son of man, that is, the essence of the life of man, man's recognizing himself as the son of God. In His own individuality Jesus personified the man who has recognized His sonship to God.¹ He asked His disciples, who men said that He, the son of man, was. His disciples replied that some took Him for John the Baptist miraculously raised from the dead, others for a prophet, and some for Elijah descended from heaven. "*But who say you that I am?*" He asked. And Peter understanding Christ exactly as He understood Himself, answered, —

"*Thou art the Messiah, the son of the living God.*"

And Christ responded : —

"*Flesh and blood have not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven ;*" in other words, "thou hast understood, not through faith in human concordances, but because, feeling thyself to be the son of God, thou

¹ Matt. xvi. 13-20.

hast understood me." And after having explained to Peter that the true faith is founded upon this sonship to God, Christ charged His other disciples that they should tell no man that He, Jesus, was the Messiah.

After this, Christ told them that although He should suffer and be put to death, the son of man claiming to be the son of God would be restored and would triumph over all. And these words are interpreted as a prophecy of His resurrection. Here are the fourteen passages¹ which are interpreted as Christ's prophecies of His own resurrection; in three of these passages it refers to Jonah in the whale's belly, in another to the rebuilding of the temple. In the other ten it says the son of man cannot be destroyed; but there is not a word about the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

In none of these passages is the word "resurrection" found in the original text. Ask any one who is ignorant of theological interpretations, but who knows Greek, to translate all these places, and he will never translate them as they stand translated. In the original we find two different words, one *ἀνίστημι*, the other *ἐγείρω*; one of these words means to "reëstablish"; the other, in the middle voice, means "to awaken, to rise up, to arouse one's self." But neither the one nor the other can ever, in any case, mean to "resuscitate" — to raise from the dead. In order to be fully convinced that these Greek words and the corresponding Hebrew word, *qum*, cannot mean to "rise from the dead," we have only to examine the scriptural passages where these words are employed, as they very frequently are, to see that in no case is the meaning "to resuscitate" admissible. The word for *voskresnut'*, *auferstehn*, *ressusciter* — "to resuscitate" — did not exist in the Greek or Hebrew tongues, for the reason that the conception corresponding to this word did not exist. To express the idea of resurrection in Greek or in Hebrew, it is necessary to employ a periphrasis, it is necessary to say "is arisen" or "has awakened" from the

¹ John ii. 19, 22; Matt. xii. 40; Luke xi. 30; Matt. xvi. 4; Matt. xvi. 21; Mark viii. 31; Luke ix. 22; Matt. xvii. 23; Mark ix. 31; Matt. xx. 19; Mark x. 34; Luke xviii. 33; Matt. xxvi. 32; Mark xiv. 25.

dead. Thus, in the Gospel of Matthew, xiv. 2, where reference is made to Herod's belief that John the Baptist had been resuscitated, we read, *αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν*, "has awakened from the dead." In the same manner, in Luke xvi. 31, at the close of the parable of Lazarus, it says that even if any one arose from the dead, men would not believe him, and there also it says *ἐάν τις ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ*, "if one arose from the dead." But, if in these passages the words "from the dead" were not added to the words "arose" or "awakened," these words "arise" or "waken," never signified and never could signify resuscitation. When Christ spoke of Himself, in all these places, He did not once use the words "among the dead" in any of the passages quoted in support of His prophecy of His own resurrection.

Our conception of the resurrection is so entirely foreign to the Hebrews' conception of life, that we cannot even imagine how Christ would have been able to talk to them of the resurrection, and of an eternal, individual life, which should be the lot of every man. The idea of a future eternal life comes neither from Jewish doctrine nor from Christ's teachings, but it made its way into the ecclesiastical doctrine from an entirely different source. Strange as it may seem, it cannot be denied that belief in a future life is a primitive and crude conception based upon a confused idea of the resemblance between death and sleep, — an idea common to all savage races.

The Hebraic doctrine (and much more the Christian doctrine) was far above this conception. But we are so convinced of the elevated character of this superstition, that we use it as a proof of the superiority of our doctrine to that of the Chinese or the Hindus, who do not believe in it at all. Not the theologians only, but the free-thinkers, the learned historians of religions, such as Tiele, and Max Müller, make use of the same argument. In their classification of religions, they give the first place to those that recognize the superstition of the resurrection, and declare them to be far superior to those not professing that belief. The free-thinker Schopenhauer

boldly denounced the Hebraic religion as the most despicable — *die niederträchtigste* — of all religions because it contains not a trace of — *keine Idee* — of the immortality of the soul. Actually not only the idea itself, but the word for it, were wanting to the Hebraic religion. Eternal life is the Hebrew *chayē ôlam*.¹ By *ôlam* is meant the infinite, that which is permanent in the limits of time; *ôlam* also means “world” or “cosmos.” Universal life, and much more, “eternal life,” *chayē ôlam*, is, according to the Jewish doctrine, the attribute of God alone. God is the God of life, the living God. Man, according to the Hebraic idea, is always mortal. God alone is always living. In the Pentateuch, the expression “eternal life” is twice met with; once in Deuteronomy and once in Genesis. God is represented as saying:—

“See now that I, even I, am he,
And there is no god but me:
I kill, and I make alive;
I have wounded, and I heal:
And there is none that can deliver out of my hand.
For I lift up my hand to heaven,
And say, I live forever.”²

The other time in the book of Genesis:—

“And Jehovah said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever.”³

These two are the only instances of the use of the expression “eternal life” in the Pentateuch or in the whole of the Old Testament (with the exception of another instance in the apocryphal book of Daniel), and they determine clearly the Hebraic conception of the life in general and the life eternal. Life itself, according to the Hebrews, is eternal, is in God; but man is always mortal: it is his nature to be so.

Nowhere in the Old Testament does it say as we

¹ The phrase occurs only once in the Old Testament, Dan. xii. 2.

² Deut. xxxii. 39, 40.

³ Gen. iii. 22.

are taught by the sacred histories that God breathed an immortal soul into man, or that the first man, until he sinned, was immortal. According to the first recital in the Book of Genesis,¹ God created man exactly like the animals, exactly like them male and female created he them, and commanded them likewise to increase and multiply. As it is not said in regard to animals that they are immortal, so it is not said of men that they are immortal. In the second chapter it tells how man learned to distinguish good and evil. But of life it says categorically that God drove man out of paradise and denied him access to the tree of life. Man, therefore, did not taste the fruit of the tree of life; therefore he did not acquire *chayē ʾôlam*, in other words, eternal life, and remained mortal.

According to the doctrine of the Hebrews man is man, exactly as he is—in other words, he is mortal. Life is in him only as life perpetuated from one generation to another, in a race. According to the doctrine of the Hebrews only one nation possesses in itself the possibility of life.

When God said, "Ye shall live, and not die," he addressed these words to the people. The life that God breathed into man is mortal for each separate human being; this life is perpetuated from generation to generation, if men fulfil the covenant with God, that is, obey the conditions imposed by God. After having propounded the Law, and having told them that this Law was to be found not in heaven, but in their own hearts, Moses said to the people:—

"See, I have set before you this day life and good, and death and evil; in that I command you this day to love the Eternal, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments, that you may live. I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that I have set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse: therefore choose life, that you may live, you and your seed: to love the Eternal, to obey his voice, and to cleave

¹ i. 26.

*unto him: for from him is your life, and the length of your days."*¹

The principal difference between our conception of human life and that possessed by the Jews is, that while we believe that our mortal life, transmitted from generation to generation, is not the true life, but a fallen life, a life temporarily depraved,—the Jews, on the contrary, believed this life to be the true and supreme good, given to man on condition that he will obey the will of God. From our point of view, the transmission of the fallen life from generation to generation is the transmission of a curse; from the Jewish point of view, it is the supreme good to which man can attain, on condition that he accomplish the will of God.

On this Hebraic conception of life Christ founded His doctrine of the true or eternal life, which He contrasted with the personal and mortal life. Christ said to the Jews:—

*"Search the Scriptures; for in them you think you have eternal life."*²

The young man asked Christ what he must do to have eternal life. Christ said in reply:—

"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." He did not say "eternal life," but simply "life."³ To the same question propounded by the scribe, the answer was, *"This do, and thou shalt live"*;⁴ here also, He says "live" simply, and does not add "forever." From these two instances, we know what Christ meant by eternal life; whenever He made use of the phrase in speaking to the Jews, He employed it in exactly the same sense in which it was expressed in their own law,—the accomplishment of the will of God is the eternal life.

In contrast with a temporary, isolated, and personal life, Christ taught of the eternal life which in Deuteronomy God promised to Israel,—with this difference, that while according to the notion of the Jews the

¹ Deut. xxx. 15-19

² Matt. xix. 17.

³ John v. 39.

⁴ Luke x. 28.

eternal life was to be perpetuated solely by them, the chosen people, and that whoever wished to possess this life must follow the exceptional laws given by God to Israel, according to Christ's teaching the eternal life is perpetuated in the son of man, and that to obtain it we must practise Christ's commands, which express the will of God for all humanity.

As opposed to the personal life, Christ taught us, not of a life beyond the grave, but of a universal life united with the life of humanity, past, present, and to come, the life of the son of man.

According to the teaching of the Hebrews, the personal life could be saved from death only by accomplishing the will of God as propounded in the Mosaic law. On this condition only the life of the Hebrews would not perish, but would pass from generation to generation of the chosen people of God.

According to Christ's teaching, the personal life is saved from death likewise by the accomplishment of the will of God as propounded in Christ's command. Only on this condition, according to Christ's teaching, the personal life does not perish, but becomes eternal and immutable in the son of man. The difference is, that while the worship of God as established by Moses was worship of one people's God, Christ's worship of the Father is the worship of the God of all men. The perpetuity of life in the posterity of a people is doubtful, because the people itself may disappear, and perpetuity depends upon a posterity in the flesh. Perpetuity of life, according to Christ's teaching, is indubitable, because life, according to His teaching, is transferred to the son of man who lives in harmony with the will of the Father.

But let us grant that Christ's words concerning the last judgment and the consummation of the age, and other words reported in the Gospel of John, are a promise of a life beyond the grave for the souls of mortal men,—it is none the less true that His teachings in regard to the light of life and the kingdom of God have the same meaning for us that they had for His hearers.

eighteen centuries ago; that is, that the only real life is the life of the son of man according to the Father's will.

It is easier to admit this than to admit that the doctrine of the true life, according to the Father's will, contains the conception of immortality and a life beyond the grave.

Perhaps it is fairer to presuppose that man, after this terrestrial life passed in the satisfaction of personal desires, will enter upon the possession of an eternal personal life in paradise, with all imaginable enjoyments; perhaps this is fairer, but to believe that this is so, to endeavor to persuade ourselves that for our good actions we shall be recompensed with eternal felicity, and for our bad actions punished with eternal torments, — to believe this, does not aid us in understanding Christ's teaching, but, on the contrary, deprives Christ's teaching of its chief foundation.

All Christ's teaching goes to persuade His disciples who recognize the illusoriness of the personal life to renounce it, and merge it in the life of all humanity, in the life of the son of man. Now the doctrine of the immortality of the individual soul does not impel us to renounce the personal life; on the contrary, it affirms the continuance of individuality forever.

According to the notion of the Jews, the Chinese, the Hindus, and all men who do not believe in the dogma of the fall and the redemption, life is life as it is. A man is united with a woman, engenders children, cares for them, grows old, and dies. His children grow up, and his life continues, it passes on from one generation to another without interruption, like everything else in the world, — stones, metals, earth, plants, animals, stars. Life is life, and we must make the best of it.

To live for self alone is not reasonable. And so men, from their earliest existence, have sought for some reason for living aside from the gratification of their own desires; they live for their children, for their families, for their nation, for humanity, for all that does not die with the personal life.

On the other hand, according to the doctrine of our Churches, human life, the supreme good that is known to us, is but a very small portion of another life of which we are deprived for a season. Our life, according to this conception, is not the life that God intended or was obliged to give us. Our life is degenerate and fallen, a mere fragment, a mockery of life, compared with the real life which we think God ought to give us. The principal object of our life, according to this theory, is not to try to live this mortal life conformably to the will of the Giver of Life; or to render it eternal in the generations of men, as the Hebrews believed; or to identify ourselves with the will of the Father, as Christ taught; no, it is to believe that after this unreal life the true life will begin.

Christ did not speak of the imaginary life that God ought to give us, and that God for some unexplained reason did not give us. The theory of the fall of Adam, of eternal life in paradise, of an immortal soul breathed by God into Adam, was unknown to Christ; He never spoke of it, never by one word made the slightest allusion to its existence.

Christ spoke of life as it is, as it always will be; we speak of an imaginary life which has never existed. How, then, can we understand Christ's teaching.

Christ did not anticipate such a singular change of view in His disciples. He supposed that all men understood that the destruction of the personal life is inevitable, and He revealed to them an imperishable life. He offers true peace to those that suffer; but to those that believe that they are certain to possess more than Christ gives, His doctrine cannot give anything. I am going to exhort a man to toil, assuring him that in return for it he will receive food and clothing; and suddenly this man is persuaded that he is already a millionaire. Evidently he will pay no attention to my exhortations. So it is with regard to Christ's teachings. Why should I toil for bread when I can be rich without labor? Why should I trouble myself to live this life according to the will of God, when with-

out doing so I am sure of a personal life for all eternity?

We are taught that Christ, as the second person of the Trinity, as God made manifest in the flesh, was the salvation of men; that He took upon himself the penalty for the sin of Adam and the sins of all men; that He atoned to the first person of the Trinity for the sins of humanity; that He instituted the Church and the sacraments for our salvation — believing this, the Church says, we are saved, and shall possess a personal, immortal life beyond the grave. But meanwhile we cannot deny that Christ saved and still saves men by revealing to them their inevitable ruin, showing them that He is the way, the truth, and the life, the true way of life instead of the false way of the personal life that men had heretofore followed.

If there are any who doubt the life beyond the grave and salvation based upon redemption, no one can doubt the salvation of all men, and of each individual man, if they will accept the evidence of the destruction of the personal life, and follow the true way to safety by bringing their personal wills into harmony with the will of God. Let each man endowed with reason ask himself, What is life? and What is death? and let him try to give to life and death any other meaning than that revealed by Christ.

Every notion of a personal life not based on the renunciation of self, the service of humanity, of the son of man, is a phantom which vanishes at the first application of reason. I cannot doubt that my personal life will perish, but the life of the world according to the will of the Father will not perish, and that only identification with it gives me the possibility of salvation. It is not much in comparison with the sublime belief in the future life! It is not much, but it is sure.

I am lost in a snowstorm. Some one assures me — and it seems to him so — that he sees a light in the distance, that it is in the village, but it only seems so to him and to me because we want to have it so; we strive to

reach this light, but we never can find it. Another plows through the snow; he seeks and finds the road, and he cries to us, "Go not that way, the lights you see are false, you will wander to destruction; here is the hard road, I feel it beneath my feet; it will bring us home." It is very little. When we had faith in those lights that gleamed in our deluded eyes, there seemed to be somewhere yonder a village, a warm izba, deliverance, rest; and now in exchange for it we have nothing but the solid road. But if we continue to travel toward the imaginary lights we shall perish; if we follow the road, we shall surely escape.

What, then, ought I to do, if I alone understood Christ's teaching, and I alone had trust in it among a people who neither understand it nor obey it?

What was I to do — to live like the rest of the world, or to live according to Christ's teaching? I understood Christ's teaching as expressed in His commands, and I saw that the practice of these commands would bring happiness to me and to all men in the world. I understood that the fulfilment of these commands is the will of that first cause from which my life sprang.

More than this, I saw that whatever I did I should die like a brute after a senseless life if I did not fulfil the will of the Father, and that the only chance of salvation lay in the fulfilment of His will.

Doing as all men do, I unquestionably act contrary to the welfare of all men, I unquestionably act contrary to the will of the Giver of Life, I unquestionably forfeit the sole possibility of bettering my desperate condition. Doing as Christ commands me, I continue the work common to all men who had lived before me; I contribute to the welfare of all men now living and of those who will live after me; I obey the command of the Giver of Life; I do the only thing that can save me.

The circus at Berditchevo is in flames. All are pressing and suffocating one another, struggling before the door, which opens inward.

"Back, stand back from the door; the closer you press against it, the less the chance of escape; stand back, and you will be able to get out and save yourselves!"

Whether I am alone in hearing this command, or whether many also hear and believe it, is all the same; but from the moment I have heard and understood, what can I do but fall back from the door, and call upon every one to obey the voice of the savior? I may be suffocated, I may be crushed beneath the feet of the multitude, I may perish, but my sole chance of safety is to go where the only exit is. And I can do nothing else. A savior should be a savior, that is, one who saves. And Christ's salvation is the true salvation. He appeared, He spoke, and humanity is saved.

The circus has been burning an hour, and it is necessary to make haste, otherwise the men inside may have no time to escape. But the world has been burning for eighteen hundred years; it has been burning ever since Christ said, "*I am come to send fire on the earth;*" and I suffer as it burns, and it will burn until men are saved. Do not men exist? was not this fire kindled that men might have the felicity of salvation?

Understanding this, I understood and believed that Jesus is not only the Messiah, the Christ, but that He is in truth the Saviour of the world.

I know that He is the only way, that there is no other way for me or for those that are tormented with me in this life. I know that for all and for me there is no other safety than to fulfil Christ's commands, which give to all humanity the greatest conceivable sum of benefits.

Even if I shall have greater trials to endure, even if, by fulfilling Christ's teaching, I shall the sooner die, still it does not alarm me. This might seem frightful to any one who does not realize the nothingness and absurdity of an isolated personal life, and who believes that he will never die. But I know that my life, considered in relation to my individual happiness, is, taken by itself, a stupendous farce, and that this meaningless existence

will end in a stupid death, and therefore this cannot be frightful to me. I shall die as all die, even those that have not observed the doctrine; but my life and my death will have a meaning for myself and for others. My life and my death will have added something to the life and salvation of others, and this is what Christ taught.

CHAPTER IX

IF all men practised Christ's teaching, the kingdom of God would have come upon earth; if I alone practise it, I shall do what is best for all men and for myself. There is no salvation without the fulfilment of Christ's teaching.

But who will give me the strength to practise it, to follow it without ceasing, and never to fail? "*Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.*" The disciples called upon Jesus to strengthen their faith.

"*When I wish to do good,*" says the apostle Paul, "*I do that which is evil.*" "It is difficult to be saved," is what is commonly said and thought.

A man is drowning, and calls for aid. A rope, which is the only thing that can save him, is thrown to him, but the drowning man says: "Strengthen my belief that this rope will save me. I believe that the rope will save me; but help my unbelief."

What is the meaning of this? If a man will not seize upon his only means of safety, it is plain that he does not understand his condition.

How can a Christian who professes to believe in Christ's divinity and His doctrine, whatever may be the meaning that he attaches thereto, say that he wishes to believe, and that he cannot believe? God comes upon earth, and says, "Eternal torments, fire, absolute darkness, await you; and here is your salvation—fulfil my doctrine." A believing Christian cannot help believing and profiting by the salvation thus offered to him; he cannot possibly say, "Help my unbelief."

For a man to say this, it must be that he not only

does not believe in his perdition, but he must be certain that he shall not perish.

Children have fallen from a boat into the water. They are kept floating by the current, by their still unsoaked clothes, and their feeble struggles, and they do not realize their danger. Those in the boat throw out a rope. They warn the children against their peril, and urge them to grasp the rope, — the parables of the woman and the piece of silver, the shepherd and the lost sheep, the marriage feast, the prodigal son, all have this meaning, — but the children do not believe; they refuse to believe, not in the rope, but that they are in danger of drowning. Children as frivolous as themselves have assured them that they can continue to float gaily along, even when the boat is far away. The children do not believe that their clothes will soon be saturated, the strength of their little arms exhausted, they will suffocate, sink, and perish. This they do not believe, and so they do not believe in the rope of safety.

Just as the children fallen from the boat will not grasp the rope that is thrown to them, persuaded that they will not perish, so men who believe in the immortality of the soul, convinced that there is no danger, do not practise Christ's commands, God's commands. They do not believe in what it is impossible not to believe, simply because they believe in what it is impossible to believe. And so they cry to some one, "Strengthen our faith, lest we perish."

But this is impossible. To have the faith that they will not perish, they must cease to do what will lead them to perdition, and they must begin to do something for their own safety, — they must grasp the rope of safety.

Now this is exactly what they do not wish to do; they wish to persuade themselves that they will not perish, although they see their comrades perishing one after another before their very eyes. This desire to believe in what does not exist they call faith! It is plain that they never have enough faith, and they wish for more.

When I understood Christ's teaching, I saw that what

these men call faith is that false faith denounced by the apostle James in his epistle :¹—

“What does it profit, my brethren, if a man believe he has faith, but has not works? can that faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked and in lack of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Go in peace, be ye warmed and filled; and yet you give them not the things needful to the body; what does it profit? Even so faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself. But some one will say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: Shew me thy faith which is without works, and I, by my works, will shew thee my faith. Thou believest that God is one; thou dost well: the demons also believe, and tremble. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham our father justified by works when he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect.².... Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith. For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith is dead without works.”³

James says that the only indication of faith is the acts that it inspires, and consequently that a faith which does not result in acts is of words merely, with which one cannot feed the hungry, or justify belief, or obtain salvation. A faith without acts is not faith. It is only a disposition to believe in something, a vain affirmation of belief in something in which one does not really believe.

Faith, according to this definition, is what originates works, and works are what completes faith, in other words, what makes faith faith.

The Jews said to Christ: *“What signs shewest thou then, that we may see, and believe thee? what dost thou work?”*⁴

This they said to Him when He was on the cross:

¹ The epistle of James was not accepted for a long time by the Church, and when it was accepted was subjected to various alterations: certain words are omitted, others are transposed, or translated in an arbitrary way. I have retained the accepted translation, correcting the defective passages after the Tischendorf text. — AUTHOR'S NOTE IN TEXT.

² Gen. xv. 6.

³ James ii. 14–26.

⁴ John vi. 30.

*"Let him now come down from the cross that we may see and believe."*¹

*"He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he is the king of the Israelites, let him now come down from the cross and we will believe on him."*²

To such demands for the strengthening of their faith Christ told them that their desire was vain, and that they could not be made to believe what they did not believe. *"If I tell you,"* he said, *"you will not believe;"*³ *"I told you and you believed not. But ye believe not because you are not of my sheep."*⁴

The Jews asked exactly what is asked by Church Christians; they asked for some outward sign which should make them believe in Christ's teaching. And He explained that this was impossible, and He told them why it was impossible. He told them that they could not believe because they were not of His sheep; that is, they did not follow the road of life He had pointed out to His sheep. He explained the difference between His sheep and others, He explained why some believed, and why others did not believe, and what the foundation of faith really was.

He said: *How can you believe who receive your doctrine (δόξα⁵) one of another, and seek not the doctrine that comes only from God?"*⁶

To believe, says Christ, we must seek for the doctrine that comes from God alone.

*"He that speaks of himself seeks his own doctrine (δόξαν τὴν ἰδίαν), but he that seeks the doctrine of him that sent him, the same is true, and no untruth is in him."*⁷

The doctrine of life, δόξα, is the foundation of faith.

All actions result spontaneously from faith. All kinds of faith spring from δόξα in the sense which we attribute to life. There may be an endless number of actions;

¹ Mark xv. 32.

² Matt. xxvii. 42.

³ Luke xxii. 67.

⁴ John x. 25, 26.

⁵ Here, as in other passages, δόξα has been incorrectly translated "honor"; δόξα, from the verb δοκέω, means "manner of seeing, judgment, doctrine." — AUTHOR'S NOTE.

⁶ John v. 44.

⁷ John vii. 18.

there also may be many different kinds of faith. But there are only two doctrines of life (*δόξα*). Christ repudiates the one and affirms the other.

One of these doctrines, the one that Christ repudiates, consists of the idea that the individual life is one of the essential and real attributes of man. This doctrine has been followed, and is still followed, by the majority of men; it is the source of all the divergent beliefs and acts of men.

The other doctrine, taught by Christ and by all the prophets, affirms that our personal life has no meaning save through fulfilment of God's will.

If a man confess the *δόξα* or doctrine that his own individuality is more important than anything else, he will consider that his personal welfare is the most important thing and desirable in life, and having an eye therefore on what he supposes is the chief good, — the accumulation of an estate, the attainment of distinction or glory, or the satisfaction of his lusts, — he will have a faith in accordance with this view of life, and all his acts will always correspond with his faith.

If a man's *δόξα* is different, if he finds the essence of life in fulfilling God's will as Abraham understood it and Christ taught it, then having an eye on what he supposes to be God's will, his faith will accord with his principles, and his acts will flow from his faith.

This is why those that believe that true happiness is to be found in the personal life can never have faith in Christ's teaching. All their efforts to believe in it will be always vain. To believe in it they must change their view of life. And as long as they do not change it their actions will always coincide with their faith and not with their desires and their words.

The desire to believe in Christ's teaching on the part of those who asked Him to perform miracles and of believers in our day does not and cannot correspond with their lives, however arduous their efforts may be. They may pray to Christ as God, and observe the sacraments, and give in charity, and build churches, and convert others; they may do all this, but cannot do Christ's

works because their acts flow from a faith based on an entirely different doctrine — $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ — from that which they confess. They could not sacrifice on the altar an only son as Abraham was ready to do, although Abraham had no hesitation whatever as to whether he should or should not sacrifice his son to God, to that God who alone gave the meaning and blessedness of his life. And exactly the same way Christ and His disciples could not help giving their lives for others, because such action alone constituted for them the true meaning and blessedness of their life.

This incapacity of understanding the substance of faith explains the strange desire of men to act in such a way that, while they believe it is better to live in accordance with Christ's teaching, still they endeavor with all the powers of their souls to live in opposition to this doctrine, conformably to their belief that the personal life is a sovereign good.

The basis of faith is the meaning of life, wherefrom flows the valuation which we put upon the important and good, or the trivial and corrupt, in life. Faith is the valuation of all the phenomena of life. And as now, men with a faith based on their own doctrines never can succeed at all in harmonizing this faith with the faith inspired by Christ's teaching, so it was with the early disciples.

This misapprehension is frequently referred to in the Gospels in clear and decisive terms. Several times Christ's disciples asked Him to strengthen their faith in His words.¹ After the message, so terrible to every man who believes in the personal life and who seeks his happiness in the riches of this world, after the words, "*How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God,*" and after words still more terrible for men who believe only in the personal life, that, whoever does not abandon everything, and life itself according to Christ's will, will not be saved; Peter asked, "*Behold, we have forsaken all and followed thee; what shall we have therefore?*" Then, according to Mark, James and

¹ Matt. xx. 20-28; Mark x. 35-48.

John, and according to the Gospel of Matthew, their mother, asked Him that they might be allowed to sit one on each side of Him when He should be in glory. They asked Him to strengthen their faith with a promise of future recompense. To Peter's question Christ replies with a parable;¹ to James He replies:—

"You know not what you ask; that is, you ask what is impossible; you do not understand my doctrine. My doctrine means a renunciation of the personal life, while you ask for personal glory, a personal recompense. To drink the cup I drink of (that is, live as I live) is in your power; but to sit on my right hand and on my left—that is, to be my equals—is in no one's power." And then Christ adds that only in the worldly life the great of this world had their profit and enjoyment of glory and personal power;" but you, my disciples, ought to know that the true meaning of human life is not in personal happiness, but in ministering to others, in being humiliated before all men. Man does not live to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his personal life a ransom for all."

In reply to the unreasonable demands which revealed their slowness to understand His doctrine, Christ did not command His disciples to have faith in His doctrine, that is, to modify that valuation of the good and evil things of life which flowed from their own doctrine—He knew that to be impossible—but He explained to them the meaning of that life which is the basis of true faith, that is, taught them how to discern good from evil, the important from the unimportant.

To Peter's question, "What shall we receive?" what reward for our sacrifices? Jesus replies with the parable of the laborers engaged for various periods and receiving all the same compensation.¹ Christ explains to Peter that failure to understand the doctrine is the cause of lack of faith. Christ says that only in a personal and senseless life is remuneration in proportion to the amount of work done important.

This faith in remuneration for work according to the

¹ Matt. xx. 1-16.

measure of the work is derived from the doctrine of the personal life. This faith is based upon the presumption of certain imaginary rights; but a man has a right to nothing, nor can he have. He is under obligations for the good he has received, and so he can exact nothing. Even if he were to give up his whole life to the service of others, he could not pay the debt he has incurred, and therefore the Master cannot be unjust to him. If a man sets a value upon his rights to life, if he keeps a reckoning with the First Cause from whom he has received life, he proves simply that he does not understand the meaning of life.

Men having received happiness demand something more. These men were standing in the bazaar idle and unhappy; they were not living. The householder took them and gave them the supreme welfare of life,—work. They accepted the benefits offered, and were dissatisfied. They were dissatisfied because they had no clear conception of their position. They went to the work, with their false doctrine that they had a right to their life and their work, and that consequently their work ought to be remunerated. They did not understand that this work is the highest good that is granted them, and that they should be thankful for the opportunity to work, and should not demand remuneration. And so all men who have an uncertain conception of life, as these laborers had, never can have a right and true faith.

This parable of the master and the workman returning from the field, related in response to a direct request by the disciples that He should strengthen, that He should enlarge, their faith, shows more clearly than ever the basis of the faith that Christ taught.

When Jesus told His disciples that they must forgive a brother who trespassed against them not only once, but seventy times,¹ the disciples were overwhelmed at the difficulty of observing this injunction, and said, "Yes, but.... we must believe in order to fulfil that; strengthen, increase, the faith in us." Just as a little while

¹ Luke xvii. 3-10.

before they had asked, "What shall we get in return for this?" So now they ask about this same thing, and so do in exactly the same way so-called Christians even nowadays.

I wish to believe, but cannot; "strengthen our faith that the rope of salvation may save us;" they say: "make us believe" (as the Jews said to Jesus when they demanded miracles); "either by miracles or promises of recompense, make us to have faith in our salvation."

The disciples said what we all say: "How pleasant it would be if we could live our selfish life, and at the same time believe that it would be far better to practise God's teaching by living for others." This disposition, contrary to all the spirit of Christ's teaching, is common to us all; and yet we are astonished at our lack of faith.

This radical misapprehension which existed then just as it exists now, He met with a parable illustrating true faith. Faith cannot come of confidence in what He said; faith comes only of a consciousness of our condition; faith is based only upon the rational consciousness as to what is best to do in a given situation. He showed that this faith cannot be awakened in others by promises of recompense or threats of punishment, that this can only arouse a feeble confidence which will fail at the first trial; but that the faith that removes mountains, the faith that nothing can shatter, is inspired by the consciousness of our inevitable destruction, and of the only salvation that is possible in this situation.

To have faith, we must not count on any promise of reward; we must understand that the only way of escape from a ruined life is a life conformable to the will of the Master. Every one who understands this, will not ask to be strengthened in his faith, but will work out his salvation without the need of any exhortation.

In reply to His disciples' request, to confirm them in their faith, Christ said: The householder, when he comes from the fields with his workman, does not ask the latter to sit down at once to dinner, but directs him first to attend to the cattle and to wait upon him, the master, and then to take his place at the table and dine.

This the workman does without any sense of being wronged; he does not boast and he does not demand gratitude or recompense, but he knows that so it must be, and that he is doing only what he ought to do, that this labor is the inevitable condition of his existence and the true welfare of his life. So says Christ: When you have done all that you are commanded to do, be assured that you have only fulfilled your duty. He who understands his relations to his master will understand that he has life only as he obeys the master's will; he will know in what his welfare consists, and he will have a faith for which nothing is impossible.

This is the faith Christ taught. Faith, according to Christ's teaching, has for its foundation a rational consciousness of the true meaning of life.

The foundation of faith according to Christ's teaching is light: —

*"That was the true light which lights every man that comes into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become the children of God, even to them that believe on his name."*¹

*"And this is the condemnation,² that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that does ill hates the light, and comes not to the light, lest his works should be reprov'd. But he that does the truth comes to the light, that his works may be made manifest, because they have been wrought in God."*³

He who understands Christ's teaching will not ask to be strengthened in his faith. Faith, according to Christ's teaching, is founded on the light, on the truth. Christ never called for faith in Himself; He called only for faith in the truth. To the Jews He said: —

¹ John i. 9-12.

² *Sud*, κρίσις, condemnation, judgment, does not mean *sud*, but *razdeleniye*, division, separation. — AUTHOR'S NOTE.

³ John iii. 19-21

*"You seek to kill me, a man who has told you the truth which I have heard from God."*¹

He said:—

*"Which of you convicts me of sin? If I say the truth, why do you not believe me?"*²

*"To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth hears my voice."*³

To His disciples He said:—

*"I am the way, and the truth, and the life."*⁴

"The Father," He said to His disciples, in the same chapter, ... *"shall give you another Comforter, and he will be with you forever, even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive; for it beholds him not, neither knows him: you know him; for he abides with you, and shall be in you."*⁵

He says that all His teaching, that He Himself, is truth.

Christ's teaching is the teaching about the truth. And therefore faith in Christ is not belief in anything concerning Jesus, but it is knowledge of the truth. No one can be persuaded to believe in Christ's teaching, no one can be bribed to practise it. He who understands Christ's teaching will have faith in Him, because His teaching is the truth. He who knows the truth indispensable to his happiness must believe in it, just as a man who knows that he is really drowning cannot help grasping the rope of safety.

Thus the question, What must I do to believe? is an indication Christ's teaching is not understood.

CHAPTER X

WE say, It is difficult to live according to Christ's teaching. And why should it not be difficult, when all our lives long we carefully hide from ourselves our true

¹ John viii. 40.

² John xviii. 37.

⁵ John xiv. 16, 17.

² John viii. 46.

⁴ John xiv. 6.

situation ; when we endeavor to persuade ourselves that our situation is not at all what it is, but that it is something else? And this confidence, which we call faith, we regard as sacred, and we endeavor by all possible means, by threats, by flattery, by falsehood, by stimulating the emotions, to attract men to its support. In this demand for belief in what is contrary to sense and reason, we go so far that we take as an indication of truth the very unreasonableness of the object in behalf of which we solicit the confidence of men. It was a Christian who said "*Credo quia absurdum*," and other Christians have enthusiastically repeated this, supposing that the absurd is the best medium for teaching men the truth?

Not long ago a man of intelligence and great learning said to me that the Christian teaching had no importance as a moral rule of life. Morality, he said, must be sought in the teachings of the Stoics and the Brahmins, and in the Talmud. The essence of the Christian doctrine is not in morality, he said, but in the theosophical doctrine propounded in its dogmas.

According to this I ought to prize in the Christian teaching, not what is eternal and common to humanity, not what is indispensable to life and reasonable; but the most important element of Christianity is that portion of it which cannot be understood, and is therefore useless, — and this in the name of which millions of men have perished.

We have formed a false conception of our life and the life of the world, a conception based upon wrongdoing, and inspired by selfish passions, and we consider our faith in this false conception (which we have in some way attached to Christ's teaching) as most important, and necessary for life. If men had not for centuries maintained confidence in a lie, the lie of our conception of life and the truth of Christ's teaching would long ago have been shown forth.

It is a terrible thing to say, but it sometimes seems to me that if Christ's teaching, and the Church teaching which has grown out of it, had never existed, those

who to-day call themselves Christians would be much nearer than they are now to the truth of Christ's teaching; that is, to the reasonable doctrine of the good of life. The moral doctrines of all the prophets of the world would not then be closed to them. They would have their own minor preachers of the truth, and would believe in them. Now, all truth has been revealed, and this absolute truth seemed so terrible to those whose deeds were evil that they have perverted it into a lie, and men have lost confidence in the truth.

In our European society, Christ's testimony that "To this end he had come into the world, that he should bear witness unto the truth, and that every one that was of the truth would hear his voice," — has been for a long time met with Pilate's question, "*What is truth?*" These words, expressing such a deep and melancholy irony against a Roman, we have taken seriously, and have made an article of faith.

All in our world live not only without truth, not only without the least desire to know truth, but with the firm conviction that, among all useless occupations, the most useless is the endeavor to find the truth that governs human life.

The rule of life, the doctrine which all peoples, excepting our European societies, have always considered as the most important thing, the rule of which Christ spoke as the one thing needful, is the one thing excluded from our life and from all human activity. It is turned over to a special institution called the Church, in which no one, not even those that belong to it, really believes.

The only window for the light to which the eyes of all who think and suffer are turned is shut. To the question, What am I? what ought I to do? can I not alleviate my life according to the teaching of that God who, if your words are true, came to save? the answer is: —

"Obey the authorities, and believe in the Church."

"But why do we live so ill in this world?" asks a despairing voice. "Why so much evil? May I not abstain from taking part in all this evil? Is it impossible to lighten this heavy load of wrong?"

The reply is that "It is impossible. Your desire to live well and to help others to live well is only a temptation of pride; the only thing possible is to save one's soul for the future life. If you do not wish to take part in the evil of the world, go out of it!"

This way is open to all, says the doctrine of the Church; but remember, if you choose this path, you can have no part in the life of the world; you will cease to live, and slowly kill yourself.

There are only two ways, our teachers tell us: To believe in and obey the powers that be, to participate in the organized evil about us; or to forsake the world and take refuge in a monastery, — not to sleep and not to eat, or mortify the flesh on a pillar, or to bow down and straighten up again, and to do nothing for men; either to declare Christ's teaching impracticable and accept the iniquity of life sanctioned by the Church, or to renounce life, which is equivalent to slow suicide.

However surprising it may seem to one who accepts Christ's teaching, the error whereby it is claimed that Christ's teaching is excellent for men, but impracticable, the error that he who wishes to practise this doctrine, not in word, but in deed, must retire from the world, is still more surprising. This error, that it is better for a man to retire from the world than to expose himself to the temptations of the world, existed amongst the Hebrews of old, but is entirely foreign, not only to the spirit of Christianity, but also to Judaism. Against this error, long before Christ's time was written the story of the prophet Jonah, which Jesus so loved and cited so often. The idea of the story from beginning to end is a unity. The prophet Jonah wishes to be the only righteous man, and retires from perverse men. But God shows him that he is a prophet, that for that very reason he ought to communicate to misguided men his knowledge of the truth, and so ought not to fly from misguided men, but ought rather to live in communion with them.

Jonah despises the depraved Ninevites and flees from them; but in spite of his efforts to shirk his vocation,

God brings him back by means of the whale, and the will of God is accomplished; the Ninevites receive the words of God through Jonah, and their lives are made better. But instead of rejoicing that he has been made the instrument of God's will, Jonah is angry and jealous of God's favor shown the Ninevites. He would have liked to be the only rational and righteous man. He goes out into the desert and bewails his fate and reproaches God. Then a gourd comes up over Jonah in one night and protects him from the sun, but the next night a worm devours the gourd. Jonah still more despairingly reproaches God because the gourd so dear to him has withered. Then God says to him:—

“Thou art sorry for the gourd thou callest thine own. It came up in a night, and perished in a night; and should I not have pity on a great people which was perishing, living like the beasts, unable to discern between their right hand and their left hand? Thy knowledge of the truth was needed only that thou mightest give it to those that had it not.”

Christ knew this story and often referred to it, but moreover in the Gospels we find it related how Christ, after the interview with John, who had retired into the desert, was Himself subjected to the same temptation before beginning His mission; and how He was led by the Devil (deception) into the wilderness and there tempted; and how He triumphed over this deception and in the strength of the Spirit returned to Galilee; and how from that time forth He mingled with the most depraved men, and passed His life among publicans, Pharisees, and sinners, teaching them the truth.¹

¹ Christ is led by Deception into the desert to be tempted there. Error suggests to Christ that He is not the Son of God if He cannot make stones into bread. Christ replies: “I can live without bread. I am alive by that which is breathed into me by God.” Then Error says, “If Thou livest by that which is breathed into Thee by God, then throw Thyself from the height; Thou wilt kill the flesh, but the spirit breathed into Thee by God will not perish.” Christ replies: “My life in the flesh is the will of God; to destroy my flesh is to go contrary to the will of God, to tempt God.” Then Error says: “If this be so, serve the flesh, like the rest of the world, and the flesh will reward Thee.” Christ replies: “I am powerless over the flesh; my life is in the spirit, but I cannot destroy the flesh because the

Even according to the teaching of the Church, Christ, as God in man, gave us an example of life. All of His life that is known to us was passed in the very vortex of life: with publicans, with the downfallen of Jerusalem, and with Pharisees. Christ's chief commands are that His followers shall love others and spread His doctrines. Both exact constant intercourse with the world. And yet the deduction is made that according to Christ's teaching it is necessary to retire from the world, to have nothing to do with others, and to stand on a pillar. That is, to imitate Christ we must do exactly contrary to what He taught and what He did Himself.

According to the Church commentators Christ's teaching offers itself to men of the world and to dwellers in monasteries, not as a rule of life for making it better, for oneself and others, but as a doctrine which teaches men of the world how, while living an evil life, to be saved in the other life, and monks how to render existence still worse than it is.

But Christ did not teach this.

Christ taught the truth, and if abstract truth is the truth, it will remain such in practice. If life in God is the only true life, and is in itself blessed, then it is so here in this world in spite of all the possible accidents of life. If a life here did not confirm Christ's teaching about life, then His teaching would not be true.

Christ did not ask us to pass from better to worse, but, on the contrary, from worse to better. He had pity upon men, who seemed to Him like scattered sheep perishing without a shepherd, and He promised them a shepherd and a good pasturage. He said that His disciples would be persecuted for His doctrine, and that they must bear the persecutions of the world with fortitude. But He did not say that those that followed His teaching would suffer more than those that followed the world's teaching; on the contrary, He said that those that followed the world's teaching would be wretched,

spirit is lodged in my flesh by God's will, and because as I live in the flesh I can serve only God, my Father." And Christ then leaves the desert and returns to the world. (Matt. iv. 1-11; Luke iv. 1-13.)

and that those who followed His doctrine would be blessed. Christ did not teach salvation by faith or by asceticism, that is, by a deceit of the imagination or voluntary tortures in this life, but He taught us a way of life which, while saving us from the ruinousness of the personal life, would give us, even here in this life, less of suffering and more of joy than by living the personal life. Christ in unfolding His doctrine told men that in practising it among those that did not practise it they would be, not more unhappy, but, on the contrary, much more happy than those that did not practise it. Christ says there is one infallible rule, and that was to have no care about the worldly life.

In Mark, Peter began to say to Him:—

“Lo, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what then shall we have?” Jesus replied: *“Verily, I say unto you, There is no man that has left house, or brethren, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children, or wife, or lands, for my sake, and for the gospel’s sake, but he shall receive a hundred fold more in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the age to come eternal life.”*¹

Christ declared, it is true, that those that follow His doctrine must expect to be persecuted by those that do not follow it, but He did not say that His disciples will be losers for that reason; on the contrary, He said that His disciples would have, here, in this world, greater happiness than will fall to the lot of those that do not follow Him.

That Christ said and thought this is beyond a doubt, as the clearness of His words on this subject, the meaning of His entire doctrine, His life and the life of His disciples, plainly show.

But is this true?

When we examine the abstract question as to which of the two conditions would be the better, that of Christ’s disciples or that of the disciples of the world, we are obliged to conclude that the condition of Christ’s dis-

¹ Mark x. 28–30.

ciples must be the better, since Christ's disciples, in doing good to all men, would not arouse the hatred of men. Christ's disciples, doing evil to no one, would be persecuted only by the wicked. The disciples of the world, on the contrary, are likely to be persecuted by every one, since the law of the disciples of the world is the law of each for himself, the law of struggle; that is, of persecution of one another. The chances of suffering would be the same for both with only this difference, that Christ's disciples will be prepared for suffering, while the disciples of the world will use all possible means to avoid suffering; Christ's disciples will feel that their sufferings are useful to the world, but the disciples of the world will not know why they suffer. On abstract grounds, then, the condition of Christ's disciples must be more advantageous than that of the disciples of the world.

But is it so in reality?

To answer this, let each one call to mind all the painful moments of his life, all the physical and moral sufferings that he has endured, and let him ask himself if he has suffered these calamities in the name of the world or in the name of Christ. Let every sincere man recall his past life, and he will find that he has never once suffered for practising Christ's teaching; while the greater part of the misfortunes of his life have resulted from following the doctrines of the world in opposition to his own impulses. In my own life (an exceptionally fortunate one from a worldly point of view) I can reckon up as much suffering caused by following the doctrine of the world as many a martyr has endured in the name of Christ. All the most painful moments of my life, — from the orgies and drunkenness in which I took part as a student, to the duels and wars in which I have participated, the diseases that I have endured, and the abnormal and insupportable conditions under which I now live, — all this is only martyrdom in the name of the doctrine of the world. But I speak of a life exceptionally happy from a worldly point of view. How many martyrs have suffered and are now suffering

for the doctrine of the world torments that I should find difficulty in enumerating!

We do not realize the difficulties and dangers entailed by the practice of the doctrine of the world, simply because we are persuaded that all we endure for it is unavoidable.

We are persuaded that all the calamities we inflict upon ourselves are the inevitable conditions of our life, and we cannot understand that Christ's teaching teaches us how we may rid ourselves of these calamities and render our lives happy.

To be able to reply to the question, Which of these two conditions is the happier? we must, at least for the time being, get rid of this false conception and take a careful survey of our surroundings.

Mingle with a great crowd, especially in our cities, and observe the emaciated, sickly, and distorted specimens of humanity to be found therein, and then recall your own existence and that of all the people with whose lives you are familiar; recall the instances of violent deaths and suicides of which you have heard,—and then ask yourself for what cause all this suffering and death, this despair that leads to suicide, has been endured. You will find, strange as it may seem at first, that nine-tenths of all human suffering endured by men is useless, and ought not to exist, that, in fact, the majority of men are martyrs to the doctrine of the world.

One rainy autumn Sunday, in Moscow, I rode on the tramway through the bazaar of the Sukharof Tower. For half a verst the vehicle forced its way through a compact crowd which quickly re-formed its ranks. From morning till night these thousands of men, the greater portion of them starving and in rags, tramped angrily through the mud, venting their hatred in abusive epithets and acts of violence. The same sight may be seen in all the bazaars of Moscow. Their evenings these people spend in taverns and public houses; their nights in their nooks and kennels. Sunday is the best day in their week. Monday, in their pestiferous kennels, they again take up their disgusting work.

Think of the lives of all these people, of the position in which they live in order to choose that in which they have placed themselves; think of the incessant labor which they voluntarily undergo,—men and women,—and you will see that they are true martyrs.

All these people have forsaken houses, lands, parents, often wives and children; they have renounced everything, even life itself, and they have come to the city to acquire that which according to the gospel of the world is indispensable to every one. And all of them, not to speak of the tens of thousands of unhappy people who have lost everything, and who eke out a wretched subsistence on the garbage and vodka in cheap lodging-houses, all, from factory workman, cab-driver, sewing girl, and prostitute, to rich merchants and government officials and their wives, all endure the most painful and abnormal life without being able to acquire what, according to the doctrine of the world, is indispensable to each.

Seek among all these men, from beggar to millionaire, one who would be contented with what he has earned toward what he considers necessary and indispensable according to the teaching of the world, and you will not find one such in a thousand. Each one spends all his strength to obtain what is not necessary for him, but is demanded of him according to the teaching of the world, and the absence of which constitutes his unhappiness; and scarcely has he obtained one object of his desires when he strives for another, and still another, in that endless labor of Sisyphus which destroys the lives of men.

Take the scale of income, ranging from three hundred rubles to fifty thousand rubles a year, and you will rarely find a person who is not jaded and tormented with working to gain four hundred rubles if he have three hundred, five hundred if he have four hundred, and so on endlessly. Among them all you will scarcely find one who, with five hundred rubles, is willing to adopt the mode of life of him who has only four hundred. Even if such an instance occurs, it is not inspired by a desire to make life more simple, but to amass money and lock it up.

Each strives continually to make the heavy burden of existence still more heavy, by giving himself, his soul, without reserve to the practice of the doctrine of the world. To-day we must buy an overcoat and galoshes, to-morrow, a watch and chain; the next day we must install ourselves in an apartment with a sofa and a lamp; then we must have carpets in the drawing-room and velvet gowns; then a house, horses and carriages, pictures in gilt frames, and decorations, and then — then we fall ill of overwork and die. Another continues the same task, sacrifices his life to this same Moloch, and then dies also, without realizing why he has done all this.

But possibly this existence is in itself attractive? Compare it with what men have always called happiness, and you will see that it is hideously unhappy. For what, according to the general estimate, are the principal conditions of earthly happiness, those concerning which there can be no dispute? One of the first and most generally acknowledged conditions of happiness is a life in which the link between man and nature shall not be severed, that is, a life under the open sky, in the sunshine, the pure air, communion with the earth, animals, plants. Men have always regarded it as a great unhappiness to be deprived of all these things. Men shut up in prisons feel this deprivation more keenly than any one else. Look at the life of those men who live according to the doctrine of the world? The greater their success according to the doctrine of the world, the more they are deprived of these conditions of happiness. The greater their worldly success, the less they see of the sunlight, the fields, and woods, and of wild and domestic animals. Many of them—including nearly all the women—arrive at old age without having more than two or three times seen the sun rise or the morning, without having seen the fields or a forest except from a seat in a carriage, or a railway train, without ever having sown or planted anything, and without having reared or fed a cow or a horse or a hen, and without

having the least idea how animals are born, grow, and live.

These people, surrounded by artificial light instead of sunshine, look only upon fabrics and stone and wood, fashioned by the hand of man; they hear only the roar of machinery, the roll of vehicles, the thunder of cannon, the sound of musical instruments; they smell perfumes and tobacco smoke; under their feet and hands they have nothing but fabrics, stone and wood, Because of the weakness of their stomachs and their depraved tastes, they eat food not fresh but tainted. When they move about from place to place, they are not saved from the same privations, they travel in closed carriages. Even in the country or abroad when they take journeys they have the same fabrics and wood beneath their feet; the same draperies shut out the sunshine; and the same lackeys, coachmen, dvorniks, cut off all communication with the men, the earth, the vegetation, and the animals about them. Wherever they go, they are like so many captives shut out from the conditions of happiness. As prisoners sometimes console themselves with a blade of grass that forces its way through the pavement of their prison yard, or make pets of a spider or a mouse, so these people sometimes amuse themselves with sickly house plants, a parrot, a poodle, or a monkey, which, however, they do not themselves tend.

Another inevitable condition of happiness is work: first, congenial and free work; secondly, physical work which gives an appetite and tranquil and sound sleep.

Here, again, the greater the prosperity that falls to the lot of men according to the doctrine of the world, the more such men are deprived of this second condition of happiness. All the prosperous people of the world, the dignitaries and the wealthy, either, like prisoners, are deprived of the advantages of work, and struggle unsuccessfully with the disease caused by the lack of physical exercise, and still more unsuccessfully with the ennui which pursues them — I say unsuccessfully, because labor is a pleasure only when it is necessary, and

they have need of nothing ; or else they undertake work that is odious to them, like the bankers, solicitors, administrators, and government officials, and their wives, who plan receptions and routs, and devise toilettes for themselves and their children. I say odious, because I never yet met any person of this class who was contented with his work or took as much satisfaction in it as the dvornik feels in shoveling away the snow from before their doorsteps. All these favorites of fortune are either deprived of work or are obliged to work at what they do not like, after the manner of criminals condemned to hard labor.

The third undoubted condition of happiness is the family. But the more men are enslaved by worldly success, the less do they obtain this happiness. The majority of them are libertines, who deliberately renounce the joys of family life and retain only its cares. If they are not libertines, their children are not a source of pleasure, but a burden, and all possible means, sometimes even the most painful, are employed to render marriage unfruitful. If they have children, they make no effort to cultivate the pleasures of companionship with them. According to their laws they are compelled to leave their children almost continually to the care of strangers, confiding them first to the instruction of persons who are usually foreigners, and then sending them to public educational institutions, so that of family life they have only the sorrows, and the children from infancy are as unhappy as their parents and, as far as their parents are concerned, have only one feeling — a wish for their parents' death that they may become the heirs.¹ These people are not confined in prisons, but the consequences of their way of living as regards their

¹ The justification of this existence often heard from parents is very curious. "I need nothing for myself," the father says; "this way of living is very distasteful to me; but, because of affection for my children, I do this for them." In other words: "I know for a certainty by experience that our way of living is unhappy, consequently I am training my children to be as unhappy as I am. For love of them, I bring them into a city permeated with physical and moral miasma; I give them into the care of strangers, who regard the education of the young as a lucrative enterprise;

families are more painful than the deprivation of family inflicted on prisoners.

The fourth condition of happiness is sympathetic and unrestricted intercourse with all classes of men. And the higher a man is placed in the social scale, the more certainly is he deprived of this essential condition of happiness. The higher he goes, the narrower becomes the circle of men with whom it is possible for him to associate; the lower sinks the moral and intellectual level of those few that constitute the charmed circle wherefrom there is no escape.

The peasant and his wife are free to enter into friendly relations with a whole world of men, and if a million men do not care to associate with them, there remain eighty millions of laboring people like themselves with whom they may enter into the most intimate brotherly relations, from Arkhangelsk to Astrakhan, without waiting for a ceremonious visit or an introduction.

A chinovnik and his wife will find hundreds of people who are their equals; but the clerks of a higher rank will not admit them to a footing of social equality, and they, in their turn, are excluded by others. For the wealthy society man and his wife, there are dozens of society families. From all the rest of the world they are separated. For the cabinet minister and the millionaire and their families there are only a dozen people as rich and as important as themselves. For kings and emperors, the circle is still more narrow.

Is not the whole system like a great prison where each inmate is restricted to association with two or three jailers?

Finally, the fifth condition of happiness is bodily health and a painless death. And once more the higher men ascend the social scale, the more they are deprived of this condition of happiness. Take a moderately wealthy man and his wife, and an average peasant and his wife, and notwithstanding all the hunger and exces-

I surround my children with physical, moral, and intellectual corruption." And this reasoning has to serve as a justification of the unreasonable existence led by the parents themselves. — AUTHOR'S NOTE.

sive toil which the peasantry endure through no fault of their own, but through the cruelty of men, and compare them: and you will see that the lower they are the healthier they are, and the higher they are the more sickly they are, both men and women. Recall to mind the rich men and women whom you know and have known, and you will see most of them are invalids. A person of that class whose physical disabilities do not oblige him to take a periodical course of hygienic and medical treatment is as rare as is an invalid among the laboring classes. All these favorites of fortune without exception are the victims and practitioners of sexual vices that have become a second nature, and they are toothless, gray, and bald at an age when a workingman is in the prime of manhood. Nearly all are afflicted with nerves, indigestion, or sexual diseases arising from excesses in eating, drunkenness, dissipation, and medicines; and those that do not die young, pass half of their lives under the influence of morphine or other drugs, as melancholy wrecks of humanity incapable of self-support and able to live only as parasites, or those ants which are nourished by their slaves.

Examine the manner of their dying: one has blown out his brains, another has rotted away with syphilis; this old man has died of a "konfortative," this young man has died of a castigation self-administered for the sake of excitement; one has been eaten alive by lice, another by worms; one died of drunkenness, another of gluttony, another from morphine, another from an induced abortion. One after another they perished, in the name of the doctrine of the world. And a multitude presses on behind them, like an army of martyrs, to undergo the same sufferings, the same perdition.

One life after another is cast under the chariot of this god: The juggernaut advances, crushing out their lives, and new and ever new victims with groans and sobs and curses wallow underneath it.

To follow Christ's teaching is difficult! Christ said: —
"Whoever wishes to follow me let him forsake house,

and lands, and brethren, and follow me, his God, and he shall receive in this world a hundred-fold more houses, and lands, and brethren, and besides all this, eternal life." And no one is willing even to make the experiment.

In the doctrine of the world it is commanded: "Leave house and lands and brethren; forsake the country for the filthy towns, live all your life long as a naked bath-rubber, soaping the backs of others in the steam; as a clerk in a little underground shop passing life in counting other men's kopeks; as a public prosecutor spending your days in court or immersed in documents, helping to make the fate of unhappy wretches still more unhappy; as a cabinet minister perpetually signing unnecessary papers, as the head of an army, killing men. Live this hideous life, ending in a cruel death, and you shall receive nothing in this world, and you will receive no eternal life." All listen and obey. Christ said:—

"Take up the cross and follow me," or in other words, "Bear submissively the lot awarded to thee, and obey me, God."

And no one responds.

But let the first worthless man in epaulets, a man fitted only to kill his fellows, take it into his head to say:—

"Take, not your cross, but your knapsack and gun, and march to all sorts of suffering and certain death."

And all set forth. Leaving families, parents, wives, and children, clad in grotesque costumes, subject to the will of the first comer of a higher rank, famished, benumbed, and exhausted by forced marches; they go, like a herd of cattle to the slaughter-house, not knowing where,—and yet these are not cattle, they are men. They cannot help knowing that they are driven to the slaughter-house. With the insoluble question "Why?" and with despair in their hearts they move on, to die of hunger, or cold, or contagious diseases, or, if they survive, to be brought within range of a storm of bullets and commanded to kill men whom they know not. They kill and are killed, none of them knows why or to what end.

The Turks roast them alive in the fire, flog them, disembowel them. And the next day some one whistles, and again all rush forth to meet terrible sufferings, death, and visible evil. And yet no one finds this to be difficult. Neither those that suffer nor their fathers and mothers find that this is difficult. Parents even encourage their children to go. It seems to them not only that such thing should be, but that they could not be otherwise, and that they are altogether admirable and moral.

If the practice of the doctrine of the world were easy, agreeable, and without danger, we might, perhaps, believe that the practice of Christ's teaching is difficult, frightful, and cruel. But the doctrine of the world is much more difficult, more dangerous, and more cruel, than is Christ's teaching.

Formerly, we are told, there were martyrs for Christ; but they were exceptional. We cannot count up more than about three hundred and eighty thousand of them, voluntary and involuntary, in the whole course of eighteen hundred years; but who shall count the martyrs to the doctrine of the world? For each Christian martyr there have been a thousand martyrs to the doctrine of the world, and the sufferings of each one of them have been a hundred times more cruel than those endured by the others. The number of the victims of wars in our century alone amounts to thirty millions of men. These are the martyrs to the doctrine of the world, who would have escaped suffering and death if they had merely refused to follow the doctrine of the world, to say nothing of following Christ's teaching.

All a man has to do is to do as he pleases, and refuse to go to war, and, though they might send him to dig trenches, they would not torment him at Sevastopol and Plevna. All he has to do is not to believe in the teaching of the world, and not think it indispensable to wear galoshes and a chain, to maintain a useless salon, or to do the various other foolish things the teaching of the world demands, and he will never know overwork or suffering or perpetual anxiety, or labor without rest or

result; he will remain in communion with nature; he will not be deprived of communion with nature, he will not be deprived of the work he loves, or of his family, or of his health, and he will not perish by a senseless and cruel death.

Christ never taught that martyrdom in His name was necessary. He teaches us to cease tormenting ourselves in the name of the false doctrine of the world.

Christ's teaching has a profound metaphysical meaning; Christ's teaching has a universal meaning; Christ's teaching has also, for the life of every man, a very simple, very clear, and very practical meaning. This meaning may be thus expressed: Christ teaches men not to do foolish things. This is the simple meaning of Christ's teaching, and it is accessible to all.

Christ says:—

“Be not angry; do not consider any one as lower than yourselves—that is stupid; if you are angry and offend others, so much the worse for you.”

Again He says:—

“Do not run after women, but choose one woman, and live with her—it will be better for you.”

Once more He says:—

“Bind not yourselves to any one by promises or oaths, else you may be compelled to commit foolish and wicked actions.”

Again He says:—

“Return not evil for evil, or the evil will return upon you still worse than before, like the log suspended above the honey to kill the bear.”

And again He says:—

“Do not consider men as foreigners simply because they dwell in another country and speak a language different from yours. If you consider them as enemies, they will consider you as enemies; and it will be the worse for you. And so if you do none of these foolish things it will be better for you.”

“Yes,” men say in reply to this, “but the world is so organized that to go against it is much more calamitous than to live in accordance with it. If a man refuses

military service he will be shut up in a fortress, and possibly will be shot. If a man will not do what is necessary for the support of himself and his family, he and his family will starve."

Thus argue men who strive to defend the arrangement of the world; but they do not believe so. They say this only because they cannot deny the truth of Christ's teaching, which they profess, and because they must justify themselves in some way for their failure to practise it. They not only do not believe so; they have never thought over the matter at all. They have faith in the doctrine of the world, and they only make use of the plea they have learned from the Church, — that much suffering is inevitable for those who would practise Christ's teaching; and so they have never tried to practise Christ's teaching at all.

We see countless sufferings endured by men in the name of the doctrine of the world, but in these times we hear nothing of suffering in behalf of Christ's teaching. Thirty millions of men have perished in wars, fought in behalf of the doctrine of the world; thousands of millions of beings have perished, crushed by a social system organized on the principle of the doctrine of the world; but I know not of a million, a thousand, a dozen, or a single man, who has died a cruel death, or has even suffered from hunger and cold, in behalf of Christ's teaching. This is only a ridiculous excuse, proving how little we really know of Christ's teaching. We not only do not follow it; we do not even take it seriously. The Church has explained it in such a way that it seems to be, not the doctrine of life, but a bugbear.

Christ calls men to drink of a well of living water, which is close at hand. Men are parched with thirst, they have eaten of filth and drunk one another's blood, but their teachers have told them that they will perish if they come to the fountain shown them by Christ, and men believe them and suffer torments and die of thirst within two steps of the water, not daring to approach it. All we have to do is to believe Christ, believe that He brought good upon earth, believe that He gives us thirsty

ones a fountain of living water, and go to it, to see how cunning has been the deception of the Church, and how senseless our sufferings are when salvation is so near. All we have to do is to accept Christ's teaching, frankly and simply, for the horrible error in which we each and all live to become plain to us.

Generation after generation of us struggles to maintain our lives by means of violence, and the assurance of our property. We believe that the happiness of our life is in the greatest possible power, and abundance of property. We are so accustomed to this that Christ's teaching that man's happiness does not depend on fortune and power and that the rich cannot be happy appears to us a demand for sacrifice in the name of future bliss. Christ, however, did not think of calling us to sacrifice; on the contrary, He teaches us not to do what is worse, but to do what is the best for ourselves here in this present life.

Loving men, Christ taught them to refrain from maintaining themselves by violence, and not to seek after riches, just as we teach the common people to abstain, for their own interest, from quarrels and intemperance. He said that if men lived without defending themselves against violence, and without property, they would be more happy; and He confirms His words by the example of His life. He said that a man who lives according to His doctrine must be ready at any moment to endure violence from others, and, possibly, to die of hunger and cold, and must not count on a single hour of life. This seems to us a terrible demand for sacrifices, but it is simply a statement of the conditions under which every man will always continue to exist.

A disciple of Christ must be prepared at every moment for suffering and death. But is not the disciple of the world in the same situation? We are so accustomed to our deception that everything we do for so-called security of life, — our armies, fortresses, provisions, our wardrobes, our medical treatments, all our goods, and our money, — seems to us like something actual, seriously guaranteeing our existence.

We forget what is evident to every one — what happened to the man who resolved to build storehouses to provide an abundance for many years : he died that very night ! Everything that we do to make our existence secure is like what the ostrich does when he stands and hides his head in order not to see how they will kill him. We do worse than the ostrich. To establish the uncertain security of an uncertain life in an uncertain future, we certainly sacrifice a certain life in a certain present.

The illusion is in the false persuasion that our existence can be made secure by our competition with others. We are so accustomed to the deception in what we call security of our existence and our property, that we do not realize what we lose by striving after it. We lose everything — we lose life itself. Our whole life is swallowed up in anxious care for personal security, with preparations for living, so that we really never live at all.

All it requires is to get rid of this habit for a moment, and study our lives from one side, and we shall see that all we do in behalf of the so-called security of existence is not done at all for the assurance of security, but simply to help us to forget that existence never has been secure and never can be secure. Not only do we deceive ourselves and spoil our true life for an imaginary life in this attempt to attain security, but we often destroy what we wish to preserve.

The French took up arms in 1870 to make their national existence secure, and the attempt resulted in the destruction of hundreds of thousands of Frenchmen. All nations who take up arms undergo the same experience.

The rich man believes that his existence is secure because he possesses money, but his money attracts a thief who kills him.

The hypochondriac makes his life secure by medical treatment, and the medical treatment slowly kills him ; if it does not kill him, at least it deprives him of life, till he is like the impotent man who for thirty-five years did not live, but waited at the pool for an angel. Christ's

teaching that we cannot possibly make life secure, but that we must be ready to die at any moment, is unquestionably better than the doctrine of the world, which obliges us to struggle for the security of existence. It is preferable because the impossibility of escaping death, and the impossibility of making life secure, is the same for Christ's disciples as it is for the disciples of the world; but, according to Christ's teaching, life itself is not swallowed up in the idle attempt to make existence secure, but is free, and can be devoted to the end for which it is worthy, — its own welfare and the welfare of others.

Christ's disciple will be poor, but he will always enjoy the gifts God has given him. He will not ruin his own existence. We make the word poverty, which is really happiness, a synonym for calamity, but the fact is not changed thereby. The poor man: it means that he will not live in the city, but in the country, he will not sit idly at home, but will work out of doors, in the woods and fields; he will see the sunshine, the sky, the animals; he will not rack his brains thinking what to eat to stimulate appetite, and what to do in order to be regular. He will be hungry three times a day, will not toss on soft pillows thinking what will save him from insomnia, but he will sleep; he will have children, and live with them, he will be in free relations with all men, and, above all, he will not do anything he does not wish to do, he will have no fear for anything that may happen to him. He will be ill, will suffer, will die, like the rest of the world; but his sufferings and his death will probably be less painful than those of the rich; and he will certainly live more happily. To be poor, to be humble, to be a tramp, — *πτωχός* signifies *brodyaga*, vagabond, — this is what Christ teaches; without this it is impossible to enter the kingdom of God, without this it is impossible to be happy here on earth.

"But no one will feed you, and you will die of hunger," they say. To this objection, that a man living in accordance with Christ's teaching will die of hunger, Christ replies in a short sentence, which has been in-

terpreted to justify the idleness of the clergy. He said :—

*"Get you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses ; no wallet for your journey, neither two coats, nor shoes, nor staff: for the laborer is worthy of his food."*¹

*"And into whatever house you shall enter, in that same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the laborer is worthy of his hire."*²

The laborer is worthy of (ἀξιός ἐστιν means, word for word, can and ought to have) his food. It is a very short sentence, but he who understands it as Christ understood it, can never argue that a man, even though he has no property, will die of hunger.

To understand the true meaning of these words we must first of all get entirely rid of that idea, quite too common amongst us, developed from the dogma of the redemption, that man's felicity consists in idleness. We must get back to that point of view natural to all uncorrupted men, that work, and not idleness, is the indispensable condition of happiness for every human being ; that man cannot help working, that it is as irksome, wearisome, and difficult for him not to work as it is irksome and wearisome for the ant, the horse, or any other animal not to work. We must rid ourselves of the savage superstition that a man who has an income from a place under the government, from landed property, or from stocks and bonds, giving him the possibility of living in idleness, is in a natural and happy position. We must restore to our consciousness the idea of work possessed by undegenerate men, the idea that Christ had when He said that the laborer is worthy of his food. Christ did not imagine that men would regard work as a curse, and consequently He did not have in mind a man who would not work, or desired not to work. He always supposed that His disciples would work, and so He said, If a man works, his work shall feed him. He who makes use of the labor of another will provide food for him who labors, simply because he profits by that labor. And so he who works will always

¹ Matt. x. 10.

² Luke x. 5, 7.

have food ; he may not have property, but as to food, there need be no uncertainty whatever.

The difference between Christ's teaching and the doctrine of the world, in regard to work, is that according to the doctrine of the world, work is a special merit in a man, whereby he makes agreements with others, and supposes that he has the right to a sustenance large in proportion to his work. According to Christ's teaching, labor is the inevitable condition of human life, and food is the inevitable consequence of labor. Labor produces food, and food produces labor. This is the eternal circle ; the one is the cause and consequence of the other. However bad the employer may be, he will always feed his workman, as he will always feed the horse which works for him ; he feeds him that he may get all the work possible ; in other words, he will coöperate in the very thing which constitutes the welfare of the workman.

"For verily the son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many."

According to Christ's teaching, every individual man, independently of what the world may be, will have a happier life if he understands that his vocation consists, not in exacting service from others, but in ministering to others, in giving his life for the ransom of many. A man who does this will be worthy of his food — in other words, he cannot fail to have it. By the words, a man does not live in order that men may work for him, but that he may work for others, Christ established a principle which would undoubtedly insure the material existence of man ; and by the words, *"the laborer is worthy of his food,"* Christ sets aside once for all the too common objection that a man who should practise Christ's teaching in the midst of those who do not practise it would perish from hunger and cold. [Christ practised His own doctrine amid great opposition, and He did not perish from hunger and cold.] He showed that a man does not insure his own subsistence by amassing worldly goods at the expense of others, but by rendering himself

useful and indispensable to others. The more necessary he is to others, the more will his existence be made secure.

In the present organization of the world there are men who do not fulfil Christ's teachings, but who possess no property and minister unto others, but they do not die of hunger. How, then, can we object to Christ's teaching, that those that practise it by working for others will perish for want of food? A man cannot die of hunger while the rich have bread. In Russia at any given minute there are always millions of men who possess no property but live entirely by their own toil.

Among pagans a Christian would be as secure as among Christians. He labors for others; consequently, he is necessary to them, and therefore he will be fed. Even a dog, if he be useful, is fed and cared for; and shall not a man be fed and cared for whose service is necessary to all?

But a sick man, a man with a family, with children, is not needed, he cannot work, and they will cease to feed him, say those who seek by all possible means to prove the justice of the worldly life. They say so, and they will continue to say so; but they themselves do not see that even while they say this and are desirous of acting in conformity to it, they cannot do so, and they act in an entirely different way. These same people, who will not admit that Christ's teaching is practicable, practise it themselves. They do not cease to feed a sheep, an ox, or a dog, when it is sick. They do not kill an old horse, but they give him work in proportion to his strength. They feed their families, their lambs, their pigs, their puppies, expecting a profit from them; and can it be that they will not care for a useful man who has fallen ill, that they will not find work suited to the strength of the old man and the child, that they will not bring up those who later on will be able to work for them in return.

Not only will they do this, but as it is they do it. Nine-tenths of men, the *chornui narod*, the "black people," the laboring classes, are cared for by the other

tenth, like so many cattle. And however great the error in which this one-tenth live, however mistaken their views in regard to the other nine-tenths of humanity, the tenth, even if they could, would not deprive the other nine-tenths of food. They will never deprive the poor of what they need in order to multiply and work. Recently this tenth has worked purposely that the nine-tenths might be regularly maintained, in other words, that the latter might furnish the maximum of work, and multiply, and bring up a new supply of workers. Ants care for the increase and welfare of their little milch cows. Shall not men do the same? and cause those whose labor they find necessary to increase? Laborers are necessary. And those that profit by labor will always be careful that their laborers are not destroyed.

The objection concerning the practicability of Christ's teaching, that if I do not acquire something for myself and keep what I have acquired, no one will feed my family, is true, but only in regard to idle, useless, and therefore obnoxious people, such as make up the majority of our opulent class. No one, except foolish parents, will care for lazy people, because lazy people are of no use to any one, not even to themselves; but the worst men will feed and support the laborer. Men rear calves, but man, as a beast of burden, is much more useful than an ox, as the tariff of the slave-mart always shows. This is why children will never be left without support.

Man does not live to be worked for, but to work for others. He who will labor will be fed.

These are truths confirmed by the life of the whole world.

Now, always, and everywhere, the man who labors receives the means of bodily subsistence just as every horse receives fodder. This subsistence is assured to him who works against his will; for such a workman desires one thing: to relieve himself of the necessity of work, and to acquire all that he possibly can in order that he may take the yoke from his own neck and place it upon the neck of the man who has sat on his neck.

A workman like this — envious, grasping, toiling against his will — will never lack for food and will be happier than one who without labor lives on the labor of others. How much happier, then, will that laborer be who labors in obedience to Christ's teaching with the object of accomplishing all the work of which he is capable and wishing for it the least possible return? How much more desirable will his condition be, when around him there will be at least a few, and possibly many, who will follow his example.

Christ's teaching with regard to labor and the fruits of labor is expressed in the story of the five and seven thousand fed with two fishes and five loaves. Humanity will enjoy the highest possible welfare when men will cease trying to grasp all that they can, and using what they have for their personal pleasure, and will do as Christ taught them by the borders of the sea.

Thousands had to be fed. One of Christ's disciples told Him that there was a man who had a few fishes; some of the disciples had also a few loaves. Jesus understood that some of the people coming from a distance had brought provisions with them and that some had not. That many had provisions with them is proved by the fact related in all the four Gospels that at the end of the meal twelve basketfuls of fragments were picked up. If no one but the lad had brought anything, how could so much have been left after so many were fed?

If Christ had not done what He did, that is, performed the miracle of feeding thousands of people with five loaves, the people would have acted as people of the world act now. Those that had food would have eaten what they had, would have compelled themselves to eat it all up, so that nothing might have been left. The mean ones, maybe, would have taken what was left to their homes. Those that had nothing would have been famished, and would have looked at their more fortunate companions with envy and hatred; some of them would perhaps have tried to take food by force from those that had it, and there would have been quarrels

and fighting; that is, the multitude would have acted just as people act nowadays.

But Christ knew exactly what He wanted to do. As it says in the Gospels, He commanded all to sit down around Him and told His disciples to give of what they had to those who had nothing, and to request others to do the same. The result was that those that had food followed the example of Christ and His disciples, and offered what they had to others. Then all ate moderately; and when they went round the circle there was sufficient for those that had not eaten at first. And all were satisfied, and so much bread remained that they filled twelve baskets.

Christ teaches men that they ought deliberately to act in this way because such is the law of man and of all eternity.

Work is the inevitable condition of human life, and work gives happiness to man. For this reason, to withhold from others the fruits of their labor or yours hinders the welfare of man.

"If men did not wrest food from others, they would die of hunger," we say. To me it would seem more reasonable to say, "If men wrest their food from one another, some of them will die of hunger," and it is so!

Every man, whether he lives according to Christ's teaching or according to the doctrine of the world, lives only by the labor of others. Others have shielded him and given him to drink and fed him, and they are still shielding him and giving him to drink and feeding him. But according to the doctrine of the world, man has a right to demand that others should continue to support and care for him and for his family. According to Christ's teaching, man is shielded and cared for and supported by others, but in order that other men continue to shield him and give him to drink and support him also, he must not require it of any one else, but must try to serve others, and so render himself useful and indispensable to mankind.

Men of the world will support any one who is useless

who demands support of them, but at the first possible opportunity they cease to feed such a one, and kill him because of his uselessness; but all men always, however wicked they may be, will support and feed the man that labors in their behalf.

Which, then, is surer, the more reasonable, the more joyous life, that according to the doctrine of the world, or that according to Christ's teaching?

CHAPTER XI

CHRIST's teaching is to bring the kingdom of God on earth. It is wrong to imagine that the practice of this doctrine is difficult; it is not only not difficult, but it is inevitable for the man who has once understood it. This teaching offers the only possible chance of salvation from the certain ruin that threatens the personal life. Finally, the fulfilment of this teaching not only does not call men to endure the privations and sufferings of this life, but it puts an end to nine-tenths of the suffering which we endure in the name of the world's teaching.

When I understood this I asked myself why I had never practised a doctrine which would give me so much happiness and peace and joy; why, on the other hand, I always had practised an entirely different doctrine, and thereby made myself wretched? And the reply could only be one: Because I never had known the truth; it had been concealed from me.

When Christ's teaching was first revealed to me, I did not believe that the discovery would lead me to reject the teaching of the Church. It only seemed to me that the Church had not reached those conclusions that flow from Christ's teaching; but I never thought that this new idea of Christ's teaching which had been revealed to me, and the deductions drawn from it, would separate me from the teaching of the Church. I dreaded this, and in the course of my studies I made no attempt to search out the errors in the teaching of the Church. On the contrary, I sought to close my eyes to proposi-

tions that seemed to be obscure and strange, provided they were not in evident contradiction with what I regarded as the essence of the Christian teaching.

But the further I advanced in the study of the Gospels, and the more clearly Christ's teaching was revealed to me, the more inevitable the choice became: either Christ's teaching, reasonable and simple in accordance with my conscience and giving me salvation; or an entirely different teaching, a doctrine in opposition to reason and conscience, offering me nothing except the certainty of my own perdition and that of others. I was therefore forced to reject, one after another, the dogmas of the Church. This I did against my will, struggling with the desire to mitigate as much as possible my disagreement with the Church, that I might not be obliged to separate from the Church, and thereby deprive myself of communion with fellow-believers, the greatest happiness that religion can bestow.

But when I had completed my task, I saw that in spite of all my efforts to maintain a connecting link with the Church, the separation was complete. Not only nothing remained, but I was convinced that nothing could remain.

Just as I was completing my labors the following incident took place:—

My son, a young lad, one day told me of a discussion which was going on between two domestics (uneducated persons who scarcely knew how to read) concerning a passage in some religious book which maintained that it was not a sin to put criminals to death, or to kill enemies in war. I could not believe that this could be printed in any book, and I asked to see it. The little volume which caused the dispute bore the title of "Prayer Book Explained";¹ third edition; eighth ten thousand; Moscow, 1879. On page 163 of this book I read:—

"What is the sixth commandment of God?

"Thou shalt not kill, shalt do no murder.

"What does God forbid by this commandment?

¹ "Tolkovui Molitvennik."

"He forbids us to kill, to take the life of any man.

"Is it a sin to punish a criminal with death according to the law, or to kill an enemy in war?

"No; that is not a sin. We take the life of the criminal to put an end to the wrong that he commits; we slay an enemy in war, because in war we fight for our sovereign and our native land."

And with these words closes the explanation; the law of God is abrogated! I could scarcely believe my eyes.

The disputants asked my opinion about the subject at issue. To the one that maintained the correctness of what was printed, I said that the explanation was not correct.

"Why, then, do they print what is wrong and contrary to the commandment?" he asked. I could say nothing in reply.

I kept the volume and looked over its contents. The book contained thirty-one prayers with instructions concerning genuflections and the joining of the fingers; an explanation of the *Credo*; certain citations from the fifth chapter of Matthew without any explanation whatever, for some unknown reason headed, "Commands for the Attainment of Bliss"; the ten commandments accompanied by comments that rendered most of them void; and "Troparia" for every saint's day.

As I have said, I not only had sought to avoid condemnation of the religion of the Church; I had done my best to see only its most favorable side; and having, therefore, not sought for its weaknesses, knowing its academic literature well, I was perfectly ignorant of its literature of instruction. This book of devotion, already in 1879 spread broadcast in an enormous number of copies, awakening doubts in the minds of the simplest people, amazed me. I could not believe that a prayer-book so entirely pagan, so wholly out of accord with Christianity, was deliberately spread among the people by the Church. To verify my belief, I bought and read all the books published by the synod or with its "benediction" (*blagoslovenia*), containing brief exposi-

tions of the religion of the Church for the use of children and the common people.

Their contents were to me almost entirely new, for at the time when I received my early religious instruction they had not yet appeared. As far as I could remember there were no commandments with regard to the attainment of bliss, and there was no doctrine which taught that it was not a sin to kill. No such teachings appeared in the old catechisms; they were not to be found in the catechism of Peter Mogila, or in the catechisms of Platon, or in that of Belyakof, or the abridged Catholic catechisms. The innovation was introduced by the metropolitan Philaret, who prepared a catechism for the military class, and from this catechism the "Prayer Book Explained" was compiled. Philaret's work is entitled, "The Christian Catechism of the Orthodox Church, for the Use of all Orthodox Christians," and is published, "by order of his Imperial Majesty."¹

The book is divided into three parts, "Concerning Faith," "Concerning Hope," and "Concerning Love." The first part contains the analysis of the Nicene Creed. The second part is made up of an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, and the first eight verses of the fifth chapter of Matthew, which serve as an introduction to the Sermon on the Mount, and are called for some reason, "Commands for the Attainment of Bliss."

These first two parts treat of the dogmas of the Church, prayers, and the sacraments, but they contain no rules with regard to the conduct of life.

The third part, "Concerning Love," contains an exposition of Christian duties, based, not on Christ's commandments, but upon the ten commandments of Moses. This exposition of the commandments of Moses seems to have been made for the especial purpose of teaching men not to obey them. Each commandment is followed by a reservation which completely destroys its force.

With regard to the first commandment, which enjoins the worship of God alone, the catechism inculcates the

¹ This book has been in use in all the schools and churches of Russia since 1839. — Tr.

worship of angels and saints, to say nothing of the Mother of God and the three persons of the Trinity.¹

With regard to the second commandment, not to make idols, the catechism enjoins the worship of ikons (p. 108).

With regard to the third commandment, "not to swear in vain," the catechism enjoins the taking of oaths as the principal token of legitimate authority (p. 111).

With regard to the fourth commandment, concerning the observance of the Sabbath, the catechism inculcates the observance, not of Saturday, but of Sunday, of the thirteen principal feasts, of a number of feasts of less importance, the observance of Lent, and of fasts on Wednesdays and Fridays (pp. 112-115).

With regard to the fifth commandment, "*Honor thy father and thy mother*," the catechism prescribes honor to the sovereign, the country, spiritual fathers, all persons in authority,² and of these last gives an enumeration in three pages, including "college authorities, civil, judicial, and military authorities, and masters (*sic*) in relation to their servants and serfs" (pp. 116-119).

My citations are taken from the sixty-fourth edition of the catechism, dated 1880. Twenty years have passed since the abolition of serfdom, and no one has taken the trouble to strike out the phrase which, in connection with the commandment of God to honor parents, was introduced into the catechism to sustain and justify slavery.

With regard to the sixth commandment, "*Thou shalt not kill*," the instructions of the catechism are from the first in favor of murder.

"*Question.* — What is forbidden by the sixth commandment?"

"*Answer.* — Manslaughter, or the killing of our neighbor in any manner whatever.

"*Question.* — Is all manslaughter a transgression of the law?"

¹ "Special Catechism," pp. 107, 108.

² *Natchal's tvuyushchikh f raznuikh otnosheniyakh (sic)*, those "commanding in various relations."

"*Answer.* — Manslaughter is not a transgression of the law when life is taken in *execution of duty*. For example :

"1st. When a criminal is *punished* by death according to law.

"2d. When we kill our enemies *in war* for the sovereign and our country."

The italics are in the original. Farther on we read : —

"*Question.* — With regard to manslaughter, when is the law transgressed ?

"*Answer.* — When any one conceals a murderer or sets him at liberty" (*sic*).

All this is printed in hundreds of thousands of copies, and under the name of Christian doctrine is taught with threats of penalties to every Russian. This is taught to all the Russian people. It is taught to the innocent children, — to the children to whom Christ said, "Suffer them to come unto Him, for of such is the kingdom of God"; to the children whom we must resemble, in ignorance of false doctrines, to enter into the kingdom of God; to the children whom Christ tried to protect in proclaiming woe to him who should offend one of the little ones! And the little children are obliged to learn all this, and are told that it is the only and sacred law of God.

These are not proclamations sent out clandestinely, under fear of penal servitude; they are proclamations which inflict the punishment of penal servitude on all who do not agree with the doctrines they inculcate.

As I write these lines, I experience a painful feeling of dread, simply because I have allowed myself to say that it is impossible to abolish the fundamental law of God inscribed in all laws and in all hearts, by words which explain nothing: "*According to law*," "*for the sovereign and our country*," and that this should not be taught to people.

Yes, that has happened of which Christ warned men when he said :¹ —

¹ Luke xi. 33-36; Matt. vi. 23.

"Look, therefore, whether the light that is in thee be not darkness." "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness."

The light that is in us has become darkness; and the darkness of our lives is full of terror.

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because you shut the kingdom of heaven against men: for you enter not in yourselves, neither suffer you others to enter. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you devour widows' houses, even while for a pretense you make long prayers: therefore you are still more guilty. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is become so, you make him worse than he was. Woe unto you, ye blind guides.

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you build the sepulchers of the prophets, and garnish the tombs of the righteous, and say, If we had lived in these days when there were prophets, we should not have been partakers in their blood. Wherefore you witness against yourselves, that you are the same as those that slew the prophets. Fill up, then, the measure begun by those like unto you. I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: some of them you will kill and crucify; and some of them you will scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel.

"Every blasphemy (calumny) shall be forgiven to men; but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven."

Of a truth we might say that all this was written but yesterday, not against men who no longer compass sea and land calumniating the Holy Spirit, or converting men to a religion which renders its proselytes worse than they were before, but against men who deliberately force people to embrace their religion, and persecute and bring to death all the prophets and the righteous who seek to expose their falsehoods.

I became convinced that the teaching of the Church,

although it was called "Christian," is the same darkness against which Christ struggled, and against which He commanded His disciples to strive.

Christ's teaching, like all religious teachings, has two sides: first, it is an ethical system which teaches men how to live as individuals, and in relation to one another; second, it is a metaphysical theory which explains why men should live in a given manner and not otherwise. The one is the consequence, and at the same time the cause, of the other.

Man should live in this manner because such is his destiny; or, man's destiny is this, and consequently he should follow it. These two sides of doctrinal expression are common to all the religions of the world. Such is the religion of the Brahmans, of Confucius, of Buddha, of Moses, such is the religion of the Christ. It teaches life — how to live; and it explains precisely why we must live in such a way. But, as has happened to all teachings, Brahmanism, Judaism, Buddhism, so was it with Christ's teaching. Men wander from its teachings of life, and they always find some one to justify their deviations. Those who, as Christ said, sit in Moses' seat, explain the metaphysical side in such a way that the ethical prescriptions of the doctrine cease to be regarded as obligatory, and are replaced by external forms of worship, by ceremonial. This is a condition common to all religions, but it seems to me that this phenomenon has never been manifested with such sharpness as in Christianity; it has been manifested with especial sharpness because Christ's teaching is the most elevated of all doctrines — the most elevated because the metaphysics and ethics of Christ's teaching are so inextricably bound up together and so determine each other that one cannot be separated from the other without destroying the vitality of the whole; and still more because Christ's teaching is in itself Protestantism: that is, it is a denial not only of the ceremonial regulations of Judaism, but of all exterior rites of worship.

Therefore, in Christianity the arbitrary separation of

the metaphysics and ethics could not but disfigure the doctrine, and deprive it of every sort of meaning, and so it was. The separation between the doctrine of life and the explanation of life began with the preaching of Paul, who knew not the ethical teachings set forth in the Gospel of Matthew, and who preached a metaphysico-cabalistic theory entirely foreign to Christ; and this separation was perfected in the time of Constantine, when it was found possible to clothe the whole pagan organization of life in a Christian dress, and without changing it to call it Christianity.

After Constantine, that pagan of pagans, whom the Church for all his crimes and vices admits to the category of the saints, began the councils, and the center of gravity of Christianity was displaced till only the metaphysical portion was left in view. And this metaphysical theory, with its accompanying ceremonial, deviated more and more from its true and primitive meaning, until it has reached its present stage of development, as a doctrine which explains the mysteries of a celestial life beyond the comprehension of human reason, and, with all its complicated formulas, gives *no* religious guidance of this earthly life.

All religions, with the exception of the religion of the Christian Church, demand from their adherents, aside from forms and ceremonies, the practice of certain actions called good, and abstinence from certain actions called bad.

Judaism prescribes circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath, the giving of alms, the year of jubilee, and many other things.

Mohammedanism prescribes circumcision, prayer five times a day, tithes for the poor, pilgrimage to the tomb of the Prophet, and many other things. It is the same with all other religions. Whether these prescriptions are good or bad, they are prescriptions which exact the performance of certain actions. Pseudo-Christianity alone prescribes nothing. The Christian would be under no obligation to do anything at all, and he would be under no obligation to refrain from anything if he

did not observe fasts and prayers, which the Church itself does not recognize as obligatory. All that is necessary to the pseudo-Christian is the sacraments. But the sacraments are not performed by the believer; they are administered to him by others. The pseudo-Christian is not obliged to do anything or to abstain from anything for his own salvation, since the Church administers to him everything of which he has need. The Church baptizes him and anoints him, and gives him the eucharist, and confesses him, even after he has lost consciousness, administers extreme unction to him, and prays for him, — and he is saved.

From the time of Constantine the Christian Church has demanded no religious duties of its members. It has never required that they should abstain from anything whatever. The Christian Church has recognized and sanctioned everything that was in the pagan world. It has recognized and sanctioned divorce and slavery and courts of justice and all earthly powers and wars and the death penalty; it has only required at baptism a verbal renunciation of evil, and this only in its early days; later on, when infant baptism was introduced, it no longer required even this.

The Church, though it recognizes Christ's teaching in theory, directly denies it in practice. Instead of guiding the world in its life, the Church, through affection for the world, has expounded Christ's metaphysical doctrine so that no obligation as to the conduct of life might be derived from it, so that it did not prevent men from living differently from the way in which they have been living. The Church has surrendered to the world, and having surrendered, simply follows it. The world does as it pleases, and leaves to the Church the task of justifying its actions with explanations as to the meaning of life. The world has organized its life in absolute opposition to Christ's teaching, and the Church has devised allegories whereby it might be proved that men living contrary to Christ's teaching really live in accordance with it. The result is that the world lives a life which is worse than the pagan life, and the Church not only ap-

proves, but maintains that this existence is in exact conformity to Christ's teaching.

But time passed and the light of the true teaching of Christ, which was in the Gospels, notwithstanding that the Church, conscious of its wrong-doing, tried to conceal it — prohibiting the translation of the Bible — time passed and this light reaches the people, even through so-called heretics and free-thinkers, and the falsity of the Church's teaching is shown so clearly that men begin to change the method of living justified by the Church, into one more in accord with Christ's teaching, which has come to them independently of the Church.

Thus men unbeknown to the Church have abolished slavery which the Church justified, have put an end to class privileges, have put an end to the religious punishments justified by the Church, have abolished the divine right of emperors and popes, and are now in turn proceeding to abolish property and the State. And the Church has never forbidden and cannot forbid such action, because the abolition of these iniquities rests on the foundation of the very Christian doctrine, which the Church has preached and still preaches, though it has tried to distort it.

The teaching of human life has been emancipated from the Church, and has remained independent of it.

The Church retains its explanations, but explanations of what? A metaphysical explanation of a teaching has a meaning only when there is a gospel of life which it explains. But the Church has no gospel of life. It has only explanations of that life which it once organized, and which no longer exists. If the Church retains the explanations of that life which at one time existed, like the explanation of the catechism in regard to killing men from duty, no one believes in it. The Church has nothing left but temples and shrines and canonicals and vestments and words.

For eighteen centuries the Church has hidden the light of the Christian gospel of life behind its forms and ceremonials, and wishing to hide it in her robes, has been herself burned in this flame. The world, with its

organization sanctioned by the Church, has rejected the Church in the name of the very principles of Christianity which the Church has reluctantly professed, and lives without it. This is an absolute fact and cannot be concealed. Everything that truly lives, not moodily eating out its heart, thus not living, but only preventing others from living, everything that is living in our world of Europe to-day, is detached from the Church, from all churches, and has an existence independent of the Church. Let it not be said that this is true only of the effete Western Europe. Our Russia, with its millions of Christian rationalists, civilized and uncivilized, who have rejected the doctrine of the Church, proves incontestably that as regards emancipation from the yoke of the Church, she is, thanks be to God, far more effete than Europe.

Everything that lives is independent of the Church.

The power of the State is based on tradition, on science, on popular suffrage, on brute force, on whatever you will, except on the Church.

Wars, the relation of state with state, are governed by principles of nationality, of the balance of power, but not by the Church.

The institutions established by the State frankly ignore the Church. The idea that the Church can, in these times, serve as a basis for justice or the conservation of property, is simply absurd.

Science not only does not sustain the doctrine of the Church, but is, in its development, entirely hostile to the Church.

Art, formerly entirely devoted to the service of the Church, has wholly forsaken it.

Not only has all life now entirely emancipated itself from the Church; it has no other relation to the Church, except that of contempt as long as the Church does not interfere with human affairs, and hatred when the Church seeks to reassert its ancient privileges. If the form which we call the Church exists, it is simply because men dread to shatter the chalice that once contained something precious. In this way only can we

account, in our age, for the existence of Catholicism, of Orthodoxy, and of the different Protestant churches.

All the churches — Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant — are like so many sentinels still keeping careful watch before the prison doors, although the prisoner has long before escaped and is mingling with them and even threatening them. All that whereby the world truly lives at the present time, socialism, communism, politico-economical theories, utilitarianism, the liberty and equality of men and of classes and of women, all the moral principles of humanity, the sanctity of work, the sanctity of reason, science, art, — all these things that make the world progress and show themselves hostile to the Church, are only fragments of the same gospel which, without knowing it, the Church itself promulgated, and which, with Christ's teaching, it has so carefully concealed.

In our day the life of the world goes on its way entirely independent of the teaching of the Church. That teaching is left so far behind, that the men of the world no longer hear the voices of the Church preachers. Indeed there is nothing to hear, because the Church only gives explanations of that organization which the world has already outgrown, and which has either entirely perished or is rapidly falling into irreparable ruin.

Some men were rowing a boat, and a pilot was steering. The men relied on the pilot, and the pilot steered well; but after a time the good pilot was replaced by another, who did not steer at all. The boat moved along rapidly and easily. At first the men did not notice that the new pilot was not steering; and they were only pleased to find that the boat went along so easily. Then they discovered that the new pilot was utterly useless, and they mocked at him, and drove him from his place.

All this would not be so serious, but the misfortune is that the men, under their impulse of indignation against the unskilful pilot, forgot that without a pilot they would not know where they were going.

This very thing has happened with our Christian society. The Church does not steer, it is easy to float,

and we have floated a long way, and all the successes of science, of which our nineteenth century is so proud, simply show that we are floating without a helmsman. We are moving onward, not knowing whither. We live and make this life of ours what it is, and really we know not why. But it is impossible to float and row not knowing where you are going, and it is impossible to live and make one's life without knowing why.

If men did nothing of themselves, but were placed by some external force in the situation where they find themselves, they might very reasonably reply to the question, "Why are you in this situation?" — "We do not know; but here we are, and submit." But men make their own positions, and not only for themselves, but also for others, and especially for their children; and so we ask, "Why do you bring together millions of troops, and why do you make soldiers of yourselves, and mangle and murder one another? Why have you expended, and why do you still expend, an enormous sum of treasure and of human energy in the construction of useless and unhealthful cities? Why do you organize childish tribunals, and send people whom you consider as criminals from France to Cayenne, from Russia to Siberia, from England to Australia, when you know that it is senseless? Why do you abandon agriculture, which you like, for work in factories and mills, which you yourselves do not like? Why do you bring up your children in such a way they will be forced to lead an existence which you find worthless? Why do you do this?"

To all these questions you cannot help replying.

If all these things were agreeable, and you liked them, even then you would be compelled to explain why you did them. But as all these things are terribly difficult, and you do them with murmuring and painful struggles, you cannot help reflecting why you do them all. We must either cease to do all this, or we must explain why we do it. Men have never lived and they never can live if this question is left unanswered. And men have always had some answer ready.

The Jew lived as he lived, that is, made war, put criminals to death, built the temple, organized his entire existence in one way and not another, because all this was prescribed in his law, which, he was convinced, God Himself had promulgated. It was the same with the Hindu, with the Chinaman, it was the same with the Roman, and it was the same also with the Mohammedan. It was the same also for the Christian a century ago, and it is the same with the great mass of ignorant Christians now.

To these questions the ignorant Christian makes this reply :

“Military service, wars, tribunals, and the death penalty, all exist in obedience to God’s law transmitted to us by the Church. This is a fallen world. All the evil that exists, exists by God’s will, as a punishment for the sins of the world, and therefore we cannot palliate this evil. We can only save our own souls by faith, by the sacraments, by prayers, and by submission to God’s will as transmitted by the Church. The Church teaches us that all Christians should unhesitatingly obey their rulers, who are the Lord’s anointed, and obey also persons placed in authority by rulers ; that they ought to defend their property and that of others by force, wage war, inflict the death penalty, and in all things submit to the authorities, who command by the will of God.”

Whether these explanations are good or bad, they once sufficed for a believing Christian, as similar explanations satisfied a Jew or a Mohammedan, and men were not obliged to renounce all reason for living according to a law which they recognized as divine. But now the time has come when only the most ignorant people have faith in any such explanations, and the number of these diminishes every day and every hour. It is impossible to check this tendency. Men irresistibly follow those that lead the way, and sooner or later must pass over the same ground as the vanguard. The vanguard are now over an abyss ; the vanguard now find themselves in a terrible position ; they have organized life to suit themselves, they have prepared the same conditions for those

that are to follow, and absolutely have not the slightest idea of why they do what they are doing. No civilized man in the vanguard of progress is able to give any reply now to the direct questions: "Why do you lead the life that you do lead? Why are you doing what you are doing?" I have tried to ask about this, and I have asked hundreds of people, and never have I got from them a direct reply. Instead of a direct reply to the direct question, "Why do you live so and why do you do so?" I have always received an answer, not to my question, but to a question I had not asked.

A believing Catholic, or Protestant, or Orthodox, asked the question why he lives as he lives, that is, contrary to Christ the Lord's teaching, instead of making a direct response, begins to speak of the melancholy state of skepticism characteristic of this generation, of evil-minded persons who spread doubt broadcast among the masses, of the importance of the future of the true Church. But he will not tell you why he does not what his faith commands. Instead of speaking of his own condition, he will talk to you about the general condition of humanity, and of the Church, as if his own life were not of the slightest significance, and his sole preoccupations were the salvation of humanity, and of what he calls the Church.

A philosopher, of whatever school he may be, whether an idealist or a spiritualist, a pessimist or a positivist, to the question why he lives as he lives, that is to say, in disaccord with his philosophical doctrine, always, instead of answering this question, will begin to talk about the progress of humanity, and about the historical law of this progress which he has discovered, and in virtue of which humanity gravitates toward good. But he never will make any direct reply to the question why he himself, in his own life, does not do what he recognizes as reasonable. It would seem as if the philosopher were as preoccupied as the believer, not with his personal life, but with observing the general laws of humanity.

The average man, the immense majority of civilized

half-believers, and who all, without exception, deplore existence, condemn its organization, and predict universal destruction, — the average man, to the question why he continues to lead a life he condemns, without making any effort to ameliorate it, always, instead of a direct reply, begins to talk about things in general, about justice, about the State, about commerce, about civilization. If he be a member of the police or a prosecuting attorney, he asks: —

“And what would become of the State, if I, to ameliorate my existence, were to cease to serve it?”

“What would become of commerce?” he will ask if he be a merchant.

“What of civilization, if I cease to work for it, and seek only to better my own condition?” will be the objection of another.

His response always will be in this form, as if the problem of his life were not in doing the good toward which he strives, but in serving the State, or commerce, or civilization.

The average man replies in just the same manner as does the believer or the philosopher. Instead of making the question personal, he substitutes a general question, and the believer and the philosopher and the average man do this because there is no answer to the personal question of life, because there is no actual teaching concerning life. And he is ashamed.

He is ashamed because he is conscious of being in the humiliating position of a man who has no doctrine of life, for no one has lived or can live without a doctrine of life. Only in our Christian world, instead of a doctrine of life and an explanation of why life is as it is, and is not otherwise, that is, instead of religion, an explanation has been substituted as to why life ought to be what it was once upon a time; and something has been called religion, though it is only a system which is not of the least use to any one, while life itself is made independent of any doctrine, in other words, is left without any definition.

Moreover, as always happens, science has declared this

fortuitous and monstrous condition of our society to be in accordance with a law of all humanity. Learned men, such as Tiele and Spencer, gravely treat of religion, understanding by religion the metaphysical doctrine of the universal principle, and never suspecting that they are not speaking of religion as a whole, but only of one of its phases.

Hence arises the very extraordinary phenomenon that in our day we see learned and intelligent men artlessly believing that they are emancipated from all religion, simply because they do not accept the metaphysical explanation of the universal principle that at some time or other, for some one or other, explained life! It does not occur to them that they must live somehow, that they are living somehow; and that the principle by which they live is their religion. These men imagine they have very elevated convictions, but no faith. Nevertheless, however they talk, they have a faith from the moment they do any reasonable act, for reasonable acts are always determined by a faith. The acts of these men are determined only by the faith that we must always do what we are commanded. The faith of men who do not accept religion is in a religion of obedience to the will of the ruling majority, in a word, submission to established authority.

We may live according to the doctrine of the world, in other words, an animal life, without recognizing any controlling motive more binding than the rules of established authority. But he who lives this way cannot affirm that he lives a reasonable life. Before affirming that we live a reasonable life, we must answer the question: "What doctrine of life do we regard as reasonable?" Alas! wretched men that we are, we have not the semblance of any such doctrine, but we have even lost all perception of the necessity for a reasonable doctrine of life.

Ask the men of our time, believers or skeptics, what theory of life they follow. They will be obliged to confess that they follow but one theory—that based on laws formulated by the functionaries of the second

section or by legislative assemblies, and enforced by the police. This is the only theory recognized by Europeans. They know that this doctrine is not from heaven, or from prophets, or from sages; they are continually finding fault with the regulations of these functionaries or legislative assemblies, but nevertheless they recognize this theory, and submit to the police charged with their enforcement, submit without murmuring to the most terrible exactions. The functionaries or the legislative assemblies have decreed that every young man must be ready for outrage and death and for the slaughter of others, and all parents that have adult sons submit to this law, which was drawn up the day before by a mercenary chinovnik, and may be changed the next day.

The idea of a law unquestionably reasonable, and binding upon every one in spirit as well as in letter, has to such a degree become obsolete in our society that the existence among the Hebrews of a law which regulated their whole life, not by forced obedience to its requirements, but by appealing to the conscience of each individual, is considered as the exclusive possession of the Hebrew people. That the Hebrews should have been willing to obey only what they recognized in the depths of their souls as the incontestable truth received directly from God, in other words, that which agreed with their consciences, is considered a national trait of the Jews. But it appears that the natural and normal state of civilized men is to obey what to their own knowledge is decreed by despicable men and enforced by policemen armed with pistols—what each one, or at least the majority of these men, regards as unjust, that is, contrary to their consciences.

I have sought in vain in our civilized society for any clearly formulated moral bases of life. There are none. No perception of their necessity exists. On the contrary, we find the extraordinary conviction that they are superfluous; that religion is nothing more than a few words about God and a future life, and a few ceremonies very useful for the salvation of the soul according to

some, and good for nothing according to others: but that life goes of itself and has no need of any fundamental bases or rules, and that we have only to do what we are told to do.

Of what is considered the essence of faith, that is, the doctrine of life and the explanation of its meaning, the first is considered as of very little importance, and as having no relation whatever to faith; the second, that is, the explanation of some bygone life, or speculations and guesses concerning the historical development of life, is considered as of great significance. In all that constitutes the life of man, in all such questions as: how shall he live? shall he go and kill men or shall he not go? shall he judge others or not? shall he educate his children in one way or another?—men of our society give themselves unreservedly to other men, who, like themselves, know not why they live, and compel their fellows to live in one way and not in another.

And men regard an existence like this as reasonable, and have no feeling of shame!

The abyss between the explanation of faith which passes for faith, and faith itself which passes for social and political life, is now as wide as it can possibly be, and the majority of civilized people have nothing to regulate life but faith in the police. This condition would be horrible if it were universal. Fortunately, even in our own time, there are men, the noblest men of our time, who are not contented with such a faith, but have their own faith as to how man ought to live.

These men are regarded as the most malevolent, the most dangerous, and generally as the most unbelieving of all human beings, and yet they are the only believing men of our time, not only believing in general, but believing Christ's teaching, if not as a whole, at least in part.

These men often know nothing at all of Christ's teaching; they do not understand it, and, like their adversaries, they refuse to accept the leading principle of the Christian faith, that of non-resistance to evil; often they hate Christ: but their whole faith with regard to what life ought to be is drawn from Christ's

teaching. However much these men may be hounded and persecuted, they are the only ones that do not tamely submit to whatever orders are given, and consequently they are the only men of our society that live a reasonable and not an animal life, the only ones that have faith.

The thread connecting the world and the Church, which gives a meaning to the world, has become weaker and weaker in proportion as the vital juices have been more and more absorbed by the world, and now, when these juices are wholly absorbed, the connecting thread is little more than a hindrance.

This is the mysterious birth process, and it is going on before our eyes. The last bond connecting with the Church will soon be severed, and the process of independent life will begin.

The teachings of the Church, with its dogmas, its councils, and its hierarchy, are undoubtedly united to Christ's teaching. The connecting link is as perceptible as the cord which unites the newly born child to its mother; but as the umbilical chord and the placenta become after parturition useless pieces of flesh, which are carefully buried out of regard for what they once nourished, so the Church has become a useless organ, to hide somewhere out of regard for what it once was.

As soon as respiration and circulation are established, the former source of nutrition becomes a hindrance to life. Vain and foolish would it be to attempt to retain the bond, and to force the child which has come into the light of day to receive its nourishment through the navel string, and not through the mouth and lungs.

But the deliverance of the baby from the mother's womb does not ensure life. The baby's life depends on a new bond of nourishment with its mother.

And so it must be with our Christian world of to-day. Christ's teaching has gestated and given birth to our world. The Church, one of the organs of Christ's teaching, has fulfilled its mission and has become useless, a hindrance. The world cannot be guided by the Church;

but the deliverance of the world from the Church will not ensure life. Life will begin when the world perceives its own weakness and the necessity for a different source of strength. And this is what must take place in our Christian world: it must cry from a consciousness of its helplessness; only this consciousness of its helplessness, a consciousness of the impossibility of depending on its former means of nourishment, and the inadequacy of any other form of nourishment except its mother's milk, will bring it to its mother's breast teeming with milk.

This modern European world of ours, outwardly so self-confident, so bold, so decided, but in the depths of its consciousness so perplexed and despairing, is exactly like a newly born baby: it sprawls, it struggles, it pushes, it gets angry, it cannot tell what to do; it is conscious that its former source of nourishment is exhausted, but it knows not where to seek for a new one.

A newly born lamb uses its eyes and ears, and frisks its tail, and leaps and bounds. It seems to you by its determined look that it knows everything; but, poor thing, it knows nothing! All the impetuosity and energy come from its mother's blood through a medium of transmission which has just been broken, nevermore to be renewed. It is in a blissful, and at the same time a perilous situation. It is full of youth and strength, but it is lost if it cannot get its mother's milk.

And so it is with our European world. Behold what a complex, what an apparently reasonable, and what an energetic life is boiling in this European world! As if all these men knew all that they are doing and why they are doing it all. Behold, with what enthusiasm, what vigor, what youthfulness, do the men of our world do what they are doing! The arts, the sciences, industry, political and administrative details, all are full of life. But this life is only because nourishment once, not so long ago, was furnished through the umbilical cord! There was the Church which transmitted the truth of Christ's teaching to the life of the world. Every manifestation of the world's life has been nourished by it, has grown and

developed by it. But the Church has done its work, and has dried up.

All the organs of the world are alive; the fountain from which they formerly received their nourishment has withered away, and they have not yet found another; and they seek everywhere, everywhere but at the breast of the mother from whom they have only just been delivered. Like the lambkin, they still possess the animation derived from nourishment already received, and they do not yet understand that their future nourishment is to be had only from their own mother, but in a different form from what was formerly given to them.

The world must now understand that the period of unconscious nourishment is ended, and that a new process of conscious nutrition must henceforth maintain its life.

This new process consists in consciously accepting those truths of the Christian teaching that were once unconsciously absorbed by humanity through the organism of the Church which still furnishes nutrition for humanity. Men must lift up that light whereby they live, but which has so long remained concealed from them, and carry it high before them and other men, and consciously live by its light.

Christ's teaching, as a religion which governs life and explains to them the meaning of life, is now before the world just as it was eighteen hundred years ago. Formerly the world had the explanations of the Church, which, in concealing the doctrine, seemed in itself to offer a satisfactory interpretation of that old life; but now the time is come when the Church has lost its usefulness, and the world, having no other way of explaining its new life, cannot help feeling its helplessness, and therefore it must go for aid directly to Christ's teaching.

Now, Christ first taught men to believe in the light, and that the light is within themselves. Christ taught men to prize higher than anything else this light of reason, taught them to live conformably with it, and to do nothing that they themselves considered contrary to reason. If you consider it contrary to reason to go out

to kill Turks or Germans, do not go; if you consider it contrary to reason to make use of the labor of poor men that you and yours may wear "cylinder" hats and lace yourselves in corsets or live in the height of fashion and maintain a salon, to be a burden to you, why, don't do so; if you consider it contrary to reason to take people already corrupted by idleness and dangerous companionship and shut them up in prison, in other words, in absolute idleness and the most dangerous companionship, do not do so; if you consider it contrary to reason to live in the pestilential air of cities when you can live in a purer atmosphere, if you consider it contrary to reason to teach your children before all and above all the grammatical laws of dead languages, do not do so. Do not do what our whole European world is doing at the present time,—living, and yet not considering its life reasonable; acting, and yet not considering its acts reasonable; but having no confidence in reason, and living in opposition to it.

Christ's teaching is the light. The light shines, and the darkness cannot compass it. Men cannot refuse to accept the light when it shines. They cannot quarrel about it, they cannot help agreeing with it. They must agree with Christ's teaching because it encircles, without coming into collision with, all the errors in which men live, and, like the ether which the physicists tells us about, permeates all things. Christ's teaching is inevitable for every man of our world in whatever situation he may be found. Men cannot help accepting Christ's teaching, not because it is impossible to deny the metaphysical explanation of life which it gives (everything may be denied), but because it alone offers rules for the conduct of life without which humanity has never lived, and never will be able to live; without which no human being has lived or can live, if he would live as man should live,—a reasonable life.

The power of Christ's teaching is not in its explanation of the meaning of life, but in what is deduced from it—in its teaching of life. Christ's metaphysical doctrine is not new; it is that eternal doctrine of humanity inscribed in

all the hearts of men, and preached by all the true prophets of the world. The power of Christ's teaching is in the application of this metaphysical doctrine to life.

The metaphysical basis of the ancient doctrine of the Hebrews and Christ is the same: love to God and men. But the application of this doctrine to life, according to Moses, as the Hebrews understood it, demanded the fulfilment of six hundred and thirteen commandments, many of which were absurd and cruel, and all based on the authority of the Scriptures. The teaching of life, according to Christ, springing from the same metaphysical basis, is expressed in five reasonable and beneficent commands, bearing in themselves meaning and justification, and embracing the whole of human life.

Christ's teaching cannot fail to be accepted by those very sincere Jews, Buddhists, Mohammedans, and others who might doubt the truth of their own law; still more must it be accepted by the men of our Christian world who have now no moral law.

Christ's teaching does not quarrel with the men of our world as regards their point of view; to begin with, it is in harmony with it, and while including it in itself, it gives them what they have not now, what is indispensable to their existence, and what they all seek, — it offers them a way of life, not an unknown way, but a way already explored and familiar to all.

You are a sincere Christian, it matters not of what confession. You believe in the creation of the world, in the Trinity, in the fall and redemption of man, in the sacraments, in prayer, in the Church. Christ's teaching is not opposed to your dogmatic belief, and is absolutely in harmony with your theory of the origin of the universe; it only gives you something that you did not possess. While you retain your present religion you feel that the life of the world and your own life are full of evil, and you know not how to remedy it. Christ's teaching (which should be binding upon you since it is the doctrine of your own God) offers you simple and practical rules which will surely deliver you and other men from the evil with which you are tormented.

Believe, if you will, in the resurrection, in paradise, in hell, in the Pope, in the Church, in the sacraments, in the redemption; pray according to the dictates of your faith, attend upon your devotions, sing your hymns, — but all this will not prevent you from practising the five commandments given by Christ for your good:—

Be not angry;

Commit not adultery;

Take no oaths;

Do not defend yourself by violence;

Do not make war.

It may happen that you will break one of these rules; you will perhaps yield to temptation, and violate one of them, just as you violate the rules of your faith, or the articles of the civil code, or the laws of propriety. In the same way you may, perhaps, in moments of temptation, fail of observing all of Christ's commands. But, in your calm moments, do not do as you do now, and so organize your existence as to render it a difficult task not to be angry, not to commit adultery, not to take oaths, not to defend yourself, not to make war; organize rather a life in which it would be difficult to do these things. You cannot help recognizing this because God commands it.

You are an unbeliever, a philosopher of any school. You affirm that the progress of the world is in accordance with a law which you have discovered. Christ's teaching does not oppose your views; it is in harmony with the law that you have discovered. But, aside from this law of yours through which the world will in the course of a thousand years reach a state of felicity, there is still your own personal life to be considered. This life you can use by living in conformity to reason, or you can waste it by living in opposition to reason, and you have now for this, your personal life, no rule whatever, except the decrees drawn up by men whom you do not esteem, and enforced by the police. Christ's teaching offers you rules which are assuredly in accord with your law, for your law of "altruism," or single will, is nothing but a poor paraphrase of this same gospel of Christ.

You are an average man, half believer, half skeptic, having no time to analyze the meaning of human life, and therefore no clearly defined theory of existence. You do what all do. Christ's teaching does not quarrel with you. It says: Very good. You are not capable of reasoning, of verifying the truth of the doctrine taught you; it is easier for you to do as others do. But however modest you may be, you know that you have within you a judge who sometimes approves your acts and sometimes condemns them. However modest your lot, there are occasions when you are bound to reflect and ask yourself, "Shall I do as all do, or in accordance with my own judgment?" Precisely on such occasions, that is, when you are called on to solve some problem with regard to the conduct of life, Christ's commands appeal to you with all their force.

And these commands will surely give answer to your inquiry, because they embrace your whole life, and they will be in accord with your reason and your conscience. If you are nearer to faith than to unbelief, you will, in following these commands, act in harmony with the will of God. If you are nearer to skepticism than to belief, you will, in thus acting, govern your actions by the most reasonable laws existing in the world, and of this you will be convinced because Christ's commands carry their own meaning and their own justification. Christ said:—

*"Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out."*¹

*"These things have I spoken unto you, that in me you may have peace. In the world you have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."*²

And indeed the world, that is, the evil in the world, is overcome.

If the world of evil still exists, it exists only as something dead, it lives only by inertia; it no longer contains the vital principle. For those who have faith in Christ's commands, it does not exist at all. It is vanquished by an awakened conscience of the son of man. A train which has been put in motion continues to move in a

¹ John xii. 31.

² John xvi. 33.

straight line ; but all the intelligent effort of a controlling hand is made manifest, and the movement is reversed.

*"For all things born of God overcome the world ; and the victory whereby the world is overcome is your faith."*¹

The faith that triumphs over the world is faith in Christ's teaching.

CHAPTER XII

I BELIEVE in Christ's teaching, and this is my faith :—

I believe that my happiness is possible on earth only when all men fulfil Christ's teaching.

I believe that the fulfilment of this teaching is possible, easy, and pleasant.

I believe that even now, when this teaching is not fulfilled, if I should be the only one among all those that do not fulfil it, there is, nevertheless, nothing else for me to do for the salvation of my life from the certainty of eternal loss but to fulfil this teaching, just as a man in a burning house, if he find a door of safety, must go out.

I believe that my life according to the teaching of the world has been a torment, and that a life according to Christ's teaching can alone give me in this world the happiness for which I was destined by the Father of Life.

I believe that this teaching will give welfare to all humanity, will save me from inevitable destruction, and will give me in this world the greatest happiness. Consequently, I cannot help fulfilling it.

*"The law was given by Moses ; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."*²

Christ's teaching is goodness and truth. Formerly, not knowing goodness, I knew not truth. Mistaking evil for good, I fell into evil, and I doubted the lawfulness of my tendency toward good. But I understand and believe now that the good toward which I strive is the will of the Father, is the most lawful essence of my life.

Christ said to me :—

"Live for the good ; believe not in those snares and

¹ 1 John v. 4.

² John i. 17.

temptations (σκάνδαλα) which, by enticing thee with the semblance of good, draw thee away from true goodness, and lead thee into evil. Thy welfare is thy unity with all men; evil is the violation of the unity with the son of man. Deprive not thyself of the good which is given thee."

Christ showed me that the unity of the son of man, the love of men for one another, is not as I had formerly supposed, merely an ideal after which men are to strive; but that this unity, this love of men for one another, is their natural condition, the condition into which according to His words children are born, the condition in which all men would live if they were not drawn aside by error, illusions, and temptations.

But Christ has not merely shown me this, He has also enumerated clearly in His commandments, without the possibility of mistake, every one of the temptations that deprive me of this natural condition of unity, love, and good, and ensnare me in evil. Christ's commands give me the means of salvation from the temptations that have deprived me of happiness; and so I cannot help believing in these commands. The good of life was given me, and I myself destroyed it. In His commands, Christ has shown me the temptations whereby I destroy my good, and therefore I cannot do what destroys my good. In this, and in this alone, is all my faith.

Christ showed me that the first temptation destructive of my good is my enmity toward men, my anger against them. I cannot help believing this, and so I cannot willingly remain at enmity with others. I cannot, as I could once, foster anger, be proud of it, fan it into flame, justify it, regarding myself as an intelligent and superior man, and others as useless and foolish people. Now, when I give up to anger, I can only realize that I alone am guilty, and seek to make peace with those that are at enmity with me.

But this is not all. While I now see that anger is an abnormal, pernicious, and morbid state, I also perceive the temptation that led me into it. The temptation was

in separating myself from other men, recognizing only a few of them as my equals, and regarding all the others as persons of no account (*raka*) or as stupid and uncultivated (*fools*). I see now that this wilful separation from other men, this calling other men *raka* or *fool*, was the principal source of my disagreements. In looking over my past life I see now that I had rarely permitted my anger to rise against those I considered as my equals, and never insulted them. But the least disagreeable action on the part of one whom I considered an inferior inflamed my anger and led me to abusive words or actions, and the more superior I felt myself to be, the more easily I insulted him; sometimes the mere supposition that a man was of a lower social position than myself was enough to provoke me to an outrageous manner.

I understand now that he alone is above others who humbles himself before others and makes himself the servant of all. I understand now why those that are great in the sight of men are an abomination to God, and why woe is threatened the rich and mighty, and why blessedness is promised the poor and humble. Now I understand this truth, I have faith in it, and this faith has transformed my perception of what is right and important, and what is wrong and despicable, in life. Everything that once seemed to me right and important — honors, glory, civilization, wealth, the complications and refinements of life, luxury, rich food, fine clothing, etiquette, — has become for me wrong and despicable. Rusticity, obscurity, poverty, austerity, simplicity of surroundings, of food, of clothing, of manners, all have now become right and important to me.

And therefore if, even now, knowing all this, I may, in a moment of forgetfulness, give myself up to anger and abuse a brother, in my quiet state of mind I cannot yield to the temptation which, raising me above other men, deprived me of my true good, — unity and love; even as a man cannot lay a snare for himself a second time after he has once been caught in one and almost lost.

Now, I can no longer give my support to anything which lifts me above or separates me from others. I cannot, as I once did, recognize in myself or others titles or ranks or qualities aside from the title and quality of man. I cannot seek for fame and glory; I cannot cultivate such sciences as would separate me from others. I cannot avoid striving to get rid of my wealth which separates me from men. In my way of life, my food, my clothing, my manners, I cannot help striving for what will not separate me from others but will unite me to the majority of men.

Christ showed me that the second temptation destructive of my welfare is wanton desire, that is, the desire to possess another woman than her to whom I am united. I cannot help believing in this, and therefore, I cannot, as I did once, consider my passionate temperament as a natural and elevated human quality. I can no longer justify it by my love for the beautiful, or my passionate nature, or my wife's faults. At the first inclination toward wanton desire I cannot fail to recognize that I am in a morbid and abnormal state, and to seek all means to rid myself of this evil.

But, knowing that wanton desire is an evil, I also know the temptation that used to seduce me into it, and so I can avoid it. I know now that the principal cause of this temptation is not that men cannot refrain from lechery, but that the majority of men and women are abandoned by those with whom they were first united. I know now that every desertion of a man or woman when the two have once been united, is that very divorce which Christ forbade, because men and women abandoned by their first companions are the original cause of all the debauchery in the world.

Recalling what led me to debauchery, I see now that besides that barbarous education whereby both physically and intellectually wanton desire was kindled in me and justified by all the subtleties of the mind; the principal temptation that led me astray was in the abandonment of the woman to whom I had first been united, and the situation of the abandoned women on all sides

around me. I see now that the principal force of the temptation was not in my carnal desires, but in the fact that those desires were not satisfied in the men and women by whom I was surrounded. I now understand Christ's words :—

*“God created them from the beginning, made them male and female. So that they are no more twain, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.”*¹

I understand now that monogamy is the natural law of humanity, which cannot with impunity be violated. I now understand perfectly the words declaring that whoever separates from his wife, that is from the woman with whom he was first united, and seeks another, compels her to resort to debauchery, and thus introduces into the world a new evil against himself.

This I believe; and the faith I now have has transformed my opinions with regard to the right and important, and the wrong and despicable, things of life. What once seemed to me the best thing—a refined, elegant life, passionate and poetic love, praised by all poets and artists, now seemed to me wicked and revolting. On the other hand a laborious, indigent, rude life, which moderates the sexual desires, now seemed to me good. The human institution of marriage, which gives an external seal of legality to the union of man and woman, does not seem to me so lofty and important as the genuine union of man and woman, which, when accomplished, can never be broken without breaking God's will.

If, when in a moment of weakness, I may fall under the promptings of desire, I know the snare that would deliver me into this evil, and so I cannot yield to it as formerly I was accustomed to do. I cannot now desire and seek for physical sloth and luxury, which excite excessive sensuality in me. I cannot now pursue amusements which kindle amorous sensuality, — novels, poetry, music, theaters, balls, — amusements which once seemed to me elevated and refining, but which I now see to be injurious. I cannot abandon my wife, for I know that

¹ Matt. xix. 4-6.

by forsaking her, I set a snare for myself, for her, and for others. I cannot encourage the gross and idle existence of others. I cannot encourage or take part in licentious pastimes, novels, plays, operas, balls, and the like, which are so many snares for myself and for others. I cannot favor the celibacy of persons fitted for the marriage relation. I cannot encourage the separation of wives from their husbands. I cannot make any distinction between unions that are called by the name of marriage, and those that are denied this name. I cannot help considering as sacred and absolute the sole and unique union by which man is once for all indissolubly bound to the first woman with whom he has been united.

Christ showed me that the third temptation destructive to my welfare is the temptation of the oath. I cannot help believing this ; consequently, I cannot, as I once did, bind myself by oath to serve any one for any purpose, and I can no longer, as I did formerly, justify myself for having taken an oath because "it would harm no one," because every one did the same, because it is necessary for the State, because the consequences might be bad for me or for some one else if I refused to submit to this exaction. I know now that it is an evil for myself and for others, and I cannot conform to it.

Nor is this all. I now know the snare that led me into evil, and I can no longer yield to it. I know that the snare is in the use of God's name to sanction an imposture, and that the imposture consists in promising in advance to obey the commands of one man, or of many men, while I ought to obey the commands of God alone. I know now that the most terrible evil in its consequences — murders in war, imprisonments, capital punishment — exists only because of the oath, in virtue of which men make themselves instruments of evil, and believe that they free themselves from all responsibility. Remembering now many and many of the evils that have impelled me to hostility and hatred, I see that they all originated with the oath, the engagement to submit to the will of others. I understand now the meaning of the words :—

*"But let your speech be, Yea, yea; nay, nay; and whatever is more than these is of evil."*¹

Understanding this, I am convinced that the oath destroys my true welfare and that of others, and this belief changes my estimate of right and wrong, of the important and despicable. What once seemed to me right and important,—the promise of fidelity to the government supported by the oath, the exacting of oaths from others, and all acts contrary to conscience, done because of the oath,—now seem to me wrong and low. Therefore I can no longer evade Christ's command forbidding the oath; I can no longer bind myself by oath to any one, I cannot exact an oath from another, I cannot encourage men to take an oath, or to cause others to take an oath; nor can I regard the oath as necessary, important, or even inoffensive, as many think.

Christ showed me that the fourth temptation destructive of my welfare is the resort to violence for the resistance of evil. I am obliged to believe that this is an evil for myself and for others; consequently, I cannot, as I once did, deliberately resort to violence, and seek to justify my action with the pretext that it is indispensable for the defense of my person and property, or of the persons and property of others. I cannot yield to the first impulse to resort to violence; I am obliged to renounce it, and to abstain from it altogether.

But besides knowing this, I know now the temptation that caused me to fall into this evil. I know now that the snare consisted in the erroneous belief that my life could be made secure by violence, by the defense of my person and property against others. I know now that a great portion of the evils that afflict mankind is due to this,—that men, instead of giving their work for others, deprive themselves completely of the privilege of work, and forcibly appropriate the labor of their fellows. Remembering now all the evil that I caused myself and others and all the evil that others have done, I see that a large part of this evil arises from the fact that we consider it possible by self-defense to guaran-

¹ Matt. v. 37.

tee and better our lives. I also understand now the words:—

"A man is born not to be worked for, but to work for others," and the meaning of the words, *"The laborer is worthy of his food."*

I believe now that my true welfare, and that of others, is possible only when every man will labor not for himself, but for another, and not only does not withhold his labor from another, but also will give it with joy to any one who has need of it. This faith changed my estimate of what is right and important, and wrong and despicable. What once seemed to me right and important, — riches, private property of every sort, honor, the maintenance of personal dignity and personal privileges, — all this has now become to me low and wrong; all that used to seem to me low and wrong — labor for others, poverty, humility, the renunciation of all property and of all personal privileges — has become good and lofty in my eyes.

If, now, in a moment of forgetfulness, I yield to the impulse to resort to violence, for the defense of my person or property, or of the persons or property of others, I cannot deliberately and calmly use this snare for my own destruction and the destruction of others. I cannot acquire property. I cannot resort to force in any form for my own defense or the defense of another, except in behalf of a child, and then only to deliver from an evil imminently threatening it. I cannot take part with any power which has for an object the defense of men and their property by violence. I cannot be a judge, or take part in a trial, or a nachalnik, or take part in the exercise of any jurisdiction whatever. I can no longer encourage others in the support of tribunals, or in the exercise of authoritative administration.

Christ showed me that the fifth temptation that deprives me of my well-being is the distinction we make between foreigners and compatriots. I cannot help believing this, and consequently, if, in a moment of forgetfulness, I have a feeling of hostility toward a man of

another nationality, I am obliged, in quiet moments of reflection, to regard this feeling as wrong. I can no longer, as I did formerly, justify my hostility by the superiority of my own people over others, or by the ignorance, the cruelty, or the barbarism of another race. At the first manifestation of this, I cannot help striving to be even more friendly with a foreigner than with one of my own countrymen.

Not only do I know now that my discrimination among different nations is an evil destructive of my welfare, but I now know the temptation that led me into this evil, and I can no longer, as I once did, deliberately and calmly yield to it. I know now that this temptation consists in the erroneous belief that my welfare is connected only with the welfare of my countrymen, and not with the welfare of all mankind. I know now that my unity with others cannot be shut off by a frontier, or by a government decree which decides that I belong to this or that nation. I know now that all men are everywhere brothers and equals. When I think now of all the evil that I have done, that I have endured, and that I have seen about me, as the consequence of national enmities, I see clearly that it is all due to that gross imposture called patriotism, — love for one's native land. When I think now of my education, I see how these hateful feelings of enmity for other nations, feelings of separation from them, were never inherent in me, but all these evil feelings were artificially inoculated in me by a senseless education. I understand now the meaning of the words:—

"Do good to your enemies, treat them as you treat your own people. You are all sons of one Father. Therefore be like your Father; in other words, make no distinction between your nation and others; be the same with all."

I understand now that true welfare is possible for me only on condition that I recognize my unity with the whole world. I believe this, and this belief has changed my estimate of what is right and wrong, important and despicable. What once seemed to me right and important — love for my country, love for my own nation, for

my empire, services rendered at the expense of the welfare of other men, military exploits — now seem to me repulsive and pitiable. What once seemed to me shameful and wrong — renunciation of nationality, and the cultivation of cosmopolitanism — now seem to me right and important. If, now, in a moment of forgetfulness, I can help a Russian more than a foreigner, and desire the success of Russia or of the Russian people, I can no longer in a calm moment yield to this temptation which destroys me and others.

I cannot recognize states or peoples; I can take no part in any quarrels between peoples or states, or any discussion between them, either oral or written, much less in any service in behalf of any particular state. I cannot take part in any of those measures based on divisions between states, — the collection of customs duties, taxes, the manufacture of arms and projectiles, or any act favoring armaments, military service, and still less in any war with other nations, — neither can I help others to do this.

I have learned in what my true welfare consists, I have faith in that, and consequently I cannot do what would inevitably deprive me of that welfare.

I not only believe that I ought to live thus, but I believe that if I live thus, my life will attain its only possible meaning, and be reasonable, pleasant, and indestructible by death.

I believe that my reasonable life, the light I bear with me, was given to me only that it might shine before men, not in words only, but in good deeds, that men may thereby glorify the Father.¹

I believe that my life and my consciousness of truth is the talent confided to me for a good purpose, and that this talent is a fire which is a fire only when it burns.

I believe that I am a Nineveh with regard to other Jonahs from whom I have learned and shall learn of the truth; but that I am also a Jonah in regard to other Ninevites to whom I am bound to transmit the truth.

I believe that the only meaning of my life is to be at-

¹ Matt. v. 16.

tained by living in the light that is within me, and not putting it under a bushel, but by holding it high before people so that they may see it. This faith gives me renewed strength to fulfil Christ's teaching, and overcomes the obstacles which used to stand in front of me.

All that once sapped within me the truth and the practicability of Christ's teaching, everything that once turned me from it, the possibility of privations, suffering, and death, inflicted by those who know not Christ's teaching, now confirm its truth and draw me into its service.

Christ said, "When you have lifted up the son of man, then shall you be drawn toward me," and I felt that I was irresistibly drawn to Him by the influence of His doctrine. "*The truth*," He says again, "*The truth shall make you free*," and I know that I am in perfect liberty.

An armed enemy will come, or even evil-minded persons attack me, I used to think, and if I do not defend myself they will rob us, and beat us, and torture us, and kill me and my neighbors, those whom I felt bound to protect, and this seemed terrible to me. But this that once troubled me now seems desirable, and confirmed the truth. I know now that the enemy and the so-called malefactors or brigands are all men like myself; that, like myself, they love good and hate evil; that they live, as I live, on the eve of death; and that, with me, they seek for salvation, and will find it only in Christ's teaching. All the evil that they do to me will be evil to them also, and so can be nothing but good for me. But if truth is unknown to them, and they do evil thinking that they do good, I know the truth, only on condition that I reveal it to those that know it not. And this I can do only by refusing to participate in evil, and thereby confessing the truth by my example.

"But hither come the enemy, — Germans, Turks, savages; if you do not make war on them, they will exterminate you!" That is untrue. If there were a society of Christians that did evil to none, and gave of their labor for the good of others, such a society would have no enemies — Germans or Turks or savages — to kill or to torture them. The foreigners would take only

what the members of this society would voluntarily give, making no distinction between Russians, Germans, Turks, or savages. But when Christians live in the midst of a non-Christian society which defends itself by war, and calls on the Christians to join in waging war, then the Christians have an opportunity of helping men by revealing the truth to those that know it not. A Christian knows the truth only to bear witness of the truth before those that know it not. He cannot bear witness in any *other* way than by example. He must renounce war and do good to all men, whether they are so-called enemies or compatriots.

"But not merely enemies, but wicked men among his own people will attack a Christian's family, and if he do not defend himself, will pillage and massacre him and his family."

This again is wrong. If all the members of this family are Christians, and consequently hold their lives only for the service of others, no man will be found unreasonable enough to deprive such people of the necessities of life or to kill them. The famous Miklukha-Maclay lived among the most bloodthirsty of savages, so it is said; they did not kill him, they revered him and followed his teachings, simply because he did not fear them, exacted nothing from them, and treated them always with kindness.

But what if a Christian lives in a non-Christian family, accustomed to defend itself and its property by a resort to violence, and is called on to take part in this defense? Then this call is simply an appeal to the Christian to fulfil the duties of his life. A Christian knows the truth only that he may show it to others, more especially to his neighbors and to those who are bound to him by ties of blood and friendship, and a Christian can show the truth only by refusing to join in the errors of others, by taking part neither with aggressors or defenders, but by abandoning all that he has to those who will take it from him, thus showing by his life that he needs nothing save the fulfilment of God's will, and that he fears nothing except disobedience to that will.

But a government cannot permit a member of the society over which it has sway, to refuse to recognize the fundamental principles of governmental order or to decline to fulfil the duties of all citizens. The government exacts from a Christian the oath, jury service, military service, and his refusal to conform to these demands may be punished by exile, imprisonment, and even by death. Then, once more, the exactions of those in authority are only an appeal to the Christian to fulfil the duty of his life. For a Christian, the exactions of those in authority are the exactions of those who do not know the truth. Consequently, a Christian who knows the truth must bear witness of the truth to those that know it not. Exile and imprisonment and death, to which in consequence of this the Christian is subjected, give him the possibility of bearing witness of the truth, not in words, but in acts. All violence — war, brigandage, executions — is not accomplished through the forces of unconscious nature; it is accomplished by men who are blinded, and do not know the truth. Consequently, the more evil these men do to the Christians, the further they are from the truth, the more unhappy they are, and the more necessary it is that they should have knowledge of the truth. Now a Christian cannot make known his knowledge of truth except by abstaining from the errors that lead men into evil; he must render good for evil. In this alone is the whole work of a Christian's life, and its whole meaning, and death cannot destroy it.

Men united by error constitute a compact mass. The compactness of this mass is the evil of the world. All the intellectual activity of humanity is directly destroying the cohesive power of deception.

All revolutions are attempts to shatter the power of evil by violence. Men think that by hammering on the mass it will cease to be a mass, and they pound on it; but, in their efforts to shatter it, they only make it more dense than it was before. The cohesion of the molecules is not destroyed. The disruptive movement must come from within, when molecule releases its hold upon molecule, and the whole mass falls into disintegration.

Error is the force that welds men together ; truth is communicated to men only by deeds of truth. Only deeds of truth, by introducing light into the conscience of each individual, can dissolve the cohesion of error, and detach men one by one from the mass united together by the cohesion of error.

This work has been going on for eighteen hundred years.

It began when Christ's commands were first given to humanity, and it will not cease till, as Christ said, "*all things be accomplished.*"¹

The Church composed of those that sought to unite men in unity by the solemn affirmation that it alone was the truth, has long since fallen to decay.

But the Church composed of men united, not by promises or consecrations, but by deeds of truth and love, has always lived and will live forever. This Church, now as then, is made up not of those that say "*Lord, Lord,*" and work iniquity, but of those that hear the words of truth and reveal them in their lives.


The members of this Church know that life is to them a blessing if they do not destroy the unity of the son of man ; and that the blessing will be lost only to those that do not obey Christ's commands. And so the members of this Church cannot help practising Christ's commands and teaching them to others.

Whether this Church be in numbers little or great, it is, nevertheless, the Church that shall never perish, the Church in which all men will be united.

"Fear not, little flock ; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

MOSCOW, January 22 (O. S.), 1884.

¹ Matt. v. 18.



HOUSE OF COUNT L. N. TOLSTOÏ AT YASNAYA POLYANA.

THE GOSPEL IN BRIEF

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

THIS present book is extracted from a larger work, which exists in manuscript, and cannot be published in Russia.

That work consists of four parts, namely :—

1. An account of that course of my personal life, and of my thoughts, which led me to the conviction that in the Christian teaching lies the truth.

2. An investigation of the Christian teaching — first, according to the interpretation of the Greek Church solely ; then, according to the interpretation of the Churches generally, and the interpretation of the apostles, councils, and so-called “Fathers.” Also, an exposition of the falsity in these interpretations.

3. An investigation of the Christian teaching, based, not upon the above interpretations, but solely upon the words and deeds ascribed to Christ by the four Gospels.

4. An exposition of the real meaning of the Christian teaching, of the motives for its perversions, and of the consequences to which it should lead.

From the third of these parts this present volume is condensed. I have there effected the fusion of the four Gospels into one, according to the real sense of the teaching. I had no need to digress from the order in which each Gospel is written, so that in my harmonisation the transpositions of verses, rather than being more, are less numerous than in the greater part of those known to me, and in our Grechoulevitch's version of the four Gospels. In my treatment of the Gospel of John there is no transposition, but all stands in the same order as in the original.

My division of the Gospel into twelve chapters (or six, since each pair of the twelve may be taken as one)

came about spontaneously from the nature of the teaching. The following is the purport of the chapters:—

1. Man is the son of the Infinite Source of Being; he is the son of this Father, not by the flesh but by the spirit.

2. And therefore, man must serve the Source of his being, in the spirit.

3. The life of all men has a divine Origin. This Origin only is sacred.

4. And therefore, man must serve this Source of all human life. This is the will of the Father.

5. Service of the Will of the Father of Life is life-giving.

6. And therefore, it is not necessary to life that each man should satisfy his own will.

7. This present life in time is the food of the true life.

8. And therefore, the true life is outside time; it is in the present.

9. Time is an illusion in life; the life of the past and the future clouds men from the true life of the present.

10. And therefore, one must aim to destroy the deception arising from the past and future, the life in time.

11. The true life is that now present to us, common to all, and manifesting itself in love.

12. And therefore, he who lives by love now, in this present, becomes, through the common life of all men, at one with the Father, the source, the foundation of life.

So that the chapters, in pairs, are related as cause and effect.

Besides these twelve chapters, this exposition includes—(a) The introduction of the first chapter of the Gospel of John, where the writer of the Gospel speaks, in his own name, as to the purport of the whole teaching: and (b) a portion of the same writer's Epistle (written probably before the Gospel); this containing the general sense to be derived from the preceding exposition.

These two parts are not essential to the teaching. Although the former, as well as the latter of them, might be omitted without loss (the more so as they come in the name of John, and not of Christ), I have, nevertheless, kept them, because, to a straightforward understanding of the whole teaching, these parts, confirming each other and the whole, as against the strange commentaries of the Churches, yield the plainest evidence of the meaning to be put upon the teaching.

At the beginning of each chapter, besides a brief indication of the subject, I had put words from the prayer taught by Jesus to His disciples, such as corresponded with the contents of the chapter.

At the conclusion of my work I found, to my astonishment and joy, that the Lord's Prayer is nothing less than Christ's whole teaching, stated in most concise form, and in that same order in which I had already arranged the chapters, each phrase of the prayer corresponding to the purport and sequence of the chapters, as follows:—

1. Our Father,	Man is the son of the Father.
2. Which art in heaven,	God is the infinite spiritual source of life.
3. Hallowed be Thy name,	May the Source of Life be held holy.
4. Thy kingdom come,	May His power be established over all men.
5. Thy will be done, as in heaven,	May His will be fulfilled, as it is in Himself,
6. So also on earth.	So also in the bodily life.
7. Give us our daily bread	The temporal life is the food of the true life.
8. This day.	The true life is in the present.
9. And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors,	May the faults and errors of the past not hide this true life from us,
10. And lead us not into temptation,	And may they not lead us into delusion,
11. But deliver us from evil,	So that no evil may come to us,
12. For Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory.	And there shall be order, and strength, and reason.

In that large third part from which this work is condensed, the Gospel according to the four Evangelists

is presented in full. But in the rendering now given, all passages are omitted which treat of the following matters, namely, — John the Baptist's conception and birth, his imprisonment and death; Christ's birth, and his genealogy; his mother's flight with him into Egypt; his miracles at Cana and Capernaum; the casting out of devils; the walking on the sea; the cursing of the fig-tree; the healing of sick, and the raising of dead people; the resurrection of Christ Himself; and, finally, the reference to prophecies fulfilled in His life.

These passages are omitted in this abridgment, because, containing nothing of the teaching, and describing only events which passed before, during, or after the period in which Jesus taught, they complicate the exposition. However one takes them, under any circumstance, they bring to the teaching of Jesus neither contradiction nor confirmation of its truth. Their sole significance for Christianity was that they proved the divinity of Jesus Christ for him who was not persuaded of this divinity beforehand. But they are useless to one whom stories of miracles are powerless to convince, and who, besides, doubts the divinity of Jesus as evidenced in His teaching.

In the large work, every departure from the ordinary version, as well as every comment added to the text, and every omission, is made clear, and proved by the comparison of the various versions of the Gospels, from the examination of contexts, and finally, by considerations, philological and other. But in the present abridged rendering, all these arguments and refutations of the false understanding of the Churches, as well as the minute notes and quotations, are omitted; because, however true and exact they may be in their places, they cannot carry conviction as to the true understanding of the teaching. The justness of a conception of this kind is better proved, not by arguing particular points, but by its own unity, clearness, simplicity, fullness, as well as by its harmony with the inner feelings of all who seek truth. Speaking generally, in regard to what divergence there is between my rendering and

the Church's authorized text, the reader must not forget that it is a gross error to represent the four Gospels, as is often done, to be books sacred in every verse and in every syllable. The reader must not forget that Jesus never Himself wrote a book, as did, for instance, Plato, Philo, or Marcus Aurelius ; that He, moreover, did not, as Socrates did, transmit His teaching to informed and literate men, but spoke to a crowd of illiterate men ; and that only a long time after His death men began to write down what they had heard from Him.

The reader must not forget that a great number of such accounts have been written, from which, at first, the Churches selected three, and then another. Moreover, in selecting those which seemed to them the best according to the proverb, "No stick without knots," the Churches, out of the enormous heap of the Christian literature, have been forced to take in with their bargain a great many knots ; so that the canonical Gospels contain nearly as many faulty passages as those Gospels rejected as apocryphal.

The reader must not forget that it is the teaching of Christ which may be sacred, but in no way can a certain measure of verses and syllables be so ; and that certain verses, from here to here, say, cannot be sacred merely because men say they are so.

Moreover, the reader must not forget that these selected Gospels are, at any rate, the work of thousands of various brains and hands of men ; that during centuries the Gospels have been selected, enlarged, and commented upon ; that the most ancient copies which have come down to us, from the fourth century, are written straight on without punctuation, so that, even after the fourth and fifth centuries, they have been the subject of the most diverse readings ; and that such variations in the Gospels may be counted up to fifty thousand. The reader must have all this present in mind in order to disengage himself from the opinion, so common among us, that the Gospels, in their present shape, have come to us directly from the Holy Spirit. The reader must not forget that, far from it being blamable to dis

encumber the Gospels of useless passages, and to illuminate passages the one by the other, it is, on the contrary, unreasonable not to do this, and to hold a certain number of verses and syllables as sacred.

On the other hand, I pray my readers to remember that, if I do not hold the Gospels to be sacred books emanating from the Holy Spirit, I yet less regard the Gospels as mere historical monuments of religious literature. I understand the theological as well as the historical standpoint on the Gospels, but regard the books myself from quite another. I pray the readers of my rendering not to be misled, either by the theological view, or by that other, so usual in our day among educated men, the historical view, neither of which I hold with. I consider Christianity to be neither a pure revelation nor a phase of history, but I consider it as the only doctrine which gives a meaning to life.

And it is neither theology nor history which has won me to Christianity; but just this, that, when fifty years old, having questioned myself, and having questioned the reputed philosophers whom I knew, as to what I am, and as to the purport of my life, and after getting the reply that I was a fortuitous concatenation of atoms, and that my life was void of purport, and that life itself is evil, I became desperate, and wished to put an end to my life. But after recalling to myself how formerly, in childhood, while I still had religious faith, life possessed meaning for me; and that the great mass of men about me, who hold to faith and are uncorrupted by wealth, possess the meaning of life: after all this, I was brought into doubt as to the justness of the reply given to me by the wisdom of men of my own station, and I tried once more to understand what answer it is that Christianity gives to those men who live a life with meaning. And I embarked upon the study of Christianity, as to what in this teaching guides the lives of men. I began to study that Christianity which I saw applied in life, and to make the comparison of this applied Christianity with the sources whence it percolates. The source of the Christian teaching is the Gospels, and there I found the

explication of the spirit which animates the life of all who really live. But along with the flow of that pure, life-giving water I perceived much mire and slime unrightfully mingled therewith; and this had prevented me, so far, from seeing the real, pure water. I found that, along with the lofty Christian teaching, are bound up the teachings of Hebraism and the Church, both of which are repugnant and foreign to the former. I thus felt myself in the position of a man to whom is given a sack of refuse, who, after long struggle and wearisome labor, discovers among the refuse a number of infinitely precious pearls. This man then knows that he is not blameworthy in his distaste for the dirt, and also that those who have gathered these pearls at the same time with the rest of the sackful, and who have preserved them, are no more to blame than himself, but, on the contrary, deserve love and respect.

I knew not the light, and I thought there was no sure truth in life; but when I perceived that only light enables men to live, I sought to find the sources of the light. And I found them in the Gospels, despite the false commentaries of the Churches. And when I reached this source of light I was dazzled with its splendor, and I found there full answers to my questions as to the purport of the lives of myself and others, — answers which I recognized as wholly harmonious with all the known answers gained among other nations, and, to my mind, surpassing all other answers.

I sought a solution of the problem of life, and not of a theological or historical question; and that is why I was indifferent to know whether Jesus Christ is or is not God, and from whom proceeds the Holy Spirit, etc. And it is just as unimportant and unnecessary to know when and by whom such and such a Gospel was written, and whether such and such a parable came from Jesus Himself or not. For me, the only important concern was this light, which, for eighteen hundred years, has shone upon mankind; which has shone upon me likewise, and which shines upon me still. But to know, more than this, how I ought to name the source of this

light, what elements compose it, and what kindled it, I in no way concerned myself.

I might end this preface here if the Gospels were newly discovered books, and if the teaching of Jesus had not been, these eighteen hundred years, the subject of a continuous series of false interpretations. But to-day, to rightly understand the teaching of Jesus as He must needs have understood it Himself, it is indispensable to know the chief causes of these false interpretations. The prime cause of such false interpretations, which make it now so difficult for us to recover the true teaching of Jesus, is the fact that, under the cover of the Christian teaching, have been preached the teachings of the Church, which are made up from explanations of most contradictory writings, in which only a small part of the true teaching enters; even that being distorted, and adapted to the commentaries. The teaching of Christ, according to this misinterpretation, is simply one link in the great chain of revelation which began with the world's beginning, and stretches into the Church of our own time.

These misinterpreters call Jesus God; but the recognition of His divinity does not make them recognize a greater importance in His words and teaching than in the words of the Pentateuch, the Psalms, the Acts, the Epistles, the Apocalypse, or even the decisions of the Councils and the writings of the Fathers.

And this false understanding allows no presentment of the teaching of Jesus which does not accord with the revelations which have preceded and followed Him; doing this with the purpose, not to make clear the meaning of the teaching of Jesus, but to harmonize, as far as possible, various writings which contradict each other; such as the Pentateuch, the Psalms, the Gospels, Epistles, Acts, and, generally, all those which pass for sacred.

It is possible, indeed, to make a limitless number of such interpretations, having for object, not truth, but the reconciliation of those two irreconcilables, the Old and the New Testaments. And, in fact, the number of

these is unlimited. This is the case with the Epistles of Paul, and with the decisions of the Councils (which last begin with the formula: "It is the will of us and the Holy Spirit"); and such, also, is the case with the decrees of popes and synods, with the teachings of the Khlysty,¹ and with all false interpreters of the thought of Jesus. All recur to the same gross sanctions of the truth of their reconcilements, affirming that these reconcilements are not the result of their personal thought, but a direct witness from the Holy Spirit.

Without entering upon an analysis of these different dogmatic systems, each of which pretends to be the only true one, we may, nevertheless, well see that all of them, beginning by holding sacred the multitude of writings which make up the Old and New Testaments, thereby impose upon themselves an insurmountable barrier to the understanding of the real teaching of Jesus; and out of this confusion necessarily results the possibility, and even the necessity, of an infinite variety of opposed sects.

The reconcilement of all the revelations can be infinitely varied, but the explanation of the teaching of one person, and one looked upon as a God, should, on the contrary, not give rise to any difference of sect. It is impossible there should be conflicting ways of interpreting the teaching of a God come down to earth. If God had so come down to reveal unfailing truth to men, at least He would have revealed it in such a way that all might understand; if, then, this has not been done, that is because it was not God who came; or if, indeed, the truths of God are such that God Himself cannot make them plain to mankind, how can men do so?

If, on the other hand, Jesus was not God, but only a great man, His teaching can still less engender sects. For the teaching of a great man is only great because it explains in a clear, understandable way that which others have set out obscurely, incomprehensibly. That which is incomprehensible in the teaching of a great man is not great. The teaching of a great man can, there-

¹ A Russian sect.

fore, engender no sects. Only, then, this interpretation, which pretends to be a revelation from the Holy Spirit, and to contain the sole truth, raises up antagonisms and gives birth to sects. However much the sects of various religions may assure us that they do not condemn those of other sects, that they pray for union with them, and have no hate to them, it is not true. Never, since the time of Arius, has a single dogma arisen from other cause than the desire to contradict an opposing dogma.

To maintain that a particular dogma is a divine revelation, inspired by the Holy Spirit, is in the highest degree presumption and folly. The highest presumption, because there is nothing more arrogant than for a man to say, "What I tell you, God Himself says through my mouth." And the highest folly, because there is nothing more stupid than to reply to one who says that God speaks by his mouth, "God says quite the opposite, and by mine own mouth." But in this way reason all the Churches; and hence have been born, and are now being born, all the sects and all the evil brought, and being brought, into the world in the name of religion.

And yet deeper than this surface evil, all the sects cherish a second internal vice, which destroys in them any character of clearness, certainty, and honesty. It is this. While these sects present us with their false interpretations, as the last revelation from the Holy Spirit, they are careful never to precisely and decisively determine what is the very essence and purport of this revelation, which they profess is continued through them, and which they call "the Christian teaching."

All the sectarians who accept the revelation from the Holy Spirit, along with the Mohammedans, recognize Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed. The Churchmen accept Moses, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit. But to Mohammedanism, Mohammed is the last prophet, who alone has given the definite explanation of the two preceding revelations, — this is the last revelation, which explains all the preceding; and this one every true believer has before him.

With the religion of the Churches it is quite otherwise. That also, like the Mohammedan, accepts three revelations, but in place of calling their religion by the name of their last revealer, that is, the "religion of the Holy Spirit," they maintain their religion to be that of Jesus, and refer themselves to His teaching. So that, in giving to us what are really their own doctrines, they pretend to rest them upon the authority of Jesus.

Those religions of the Holy Spirit which offer to us the last and most decisive of revelations, whether it be in the writings of the Apostle Paul or the decisions of such and such Councils, or the decrees of popes or patriarchs, ought to say so, and call their faith by the name of him who had the last revelation. And if the last revelation is by the Fathers of the Church, or a decree of the Patriarch of the East, or a papal encyclical, or the syllabus or the catechism of Luther or Philaretus, people should say so, and call their faith by this name; because the last revelation, which explains all the preceding, is always the most important one. But they decline to adorn their dogmatic systems with the names of these authorities, and, continuing to preach quite against Christ's own teaching, they persist in maintaining that Jesus has revealed their doctrine to them. So that, according to their teaching, Jesus declared that He, by His blood, redeemed our humanity, ruined through Adam's sin; that there are three Persons in God; that the Holy Spirit came down upon the apostles, and was transmitted to the priesthood by the laying on of hands; that seven sacraments are necessary to salvation; that communion must be in two kinds; and so on. They would have us believe that all this is part of the teaching of Jesus; whereas we shall there seek in vain even the least allusion to any such matters. The Churches which so pretend would do well in concluding to give all this to us at once as the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, not of Jesus; for, in short, only those are Christians who hold the revelation of Jesus Himself as the decisive one, in virtue of His own saying, that His followers must own no other master than Himself.

It would seem that the matter is so plain that it is not worth thinking about ; but however strange it seems to say so, it is none the less true that up till now the teaching of Jesus is not separated, on the one hand, from artificial and unwarrantable connection with the Old Testament, and, on the other hand, from the superadded fantastic notions which have been imposed upon it under cover of the name of the Holy Spirit. Up to now, there are some who, in calling Jesus the second Person of the Trinity, will not conceive of His teaching otherwise than as in accordance with the so-called revelations of the third Person, as these are found in the Old Testament, the decrees of Councils, and the conclusions of the Fathers of the Church ; and in preaching the most extravagant things, they affirm these extravagances to be the religion of Christ. Others there are who, in refusing to regard Jesus as a God, similarly conceive of His teaching, not at all as He Himself declared it, but as what Paul and the other interpreters have made of it. Whilst considering Jesus as a man, and not as a God, these learned men deprive Him of a common natural right : the right of being held responsible for His own words only, and not for the words of His misinterpreters. In their endeavors to elucidate the teaching of Jesus, they attribute to Him ideas which He never thought of uttering. The representatives of this school, to begin with Renan, the most popular of them, do not see it their duty to take the trouble of distinguishing between that which bears the stamp of Jesus Himself and that which His interpreters have wrongly ascribed to Him. And, instead of thus troubling to search out the teaching of Jesus Himself a little more deeply than the Churches have done, they have been led to seek in the events of His life, and in the facts of history contemporary with Him, the explanation of His influence and of the diffusion of His ideas.

The problem they are called upon to solve is, in effect, this —

Eighteen hundred years ago a poor wanderer appeared on earth who taught certain things. He was flogged

and executed. And since then, although many and many just men have suffered for the belief, millions of people, wise and foolish, learned and ignorant, cannot shake off the conviction that this man, alone among men, was God. Here is a strange phenomenon; how is it to be explained? The Churches explain it by saying that this man, Jesus, was really God, by which everything is explained. But if this man was not God, how are we to explain why this mere man, in particular, has been acknowledged as God?

On this point the learned people of our schools of history gather with extreme care every detail of the life of this man, without noticing that, even though they should succeed in gathering a great number of these details (in truth, they have gathered none); and even though they should succeed in entirely reconstructing the life of Jesus in the smallest details, the supreme question remains unanswered, — the question as to why Jesus, and no one else, exercised such an influence over men. The answer to this is not found in knowledge of the society in which Jesus was born, brought up, and so on; still less is it found in knowledge of the happenings in the Roman world at about this time, or in the fact that the people were inclined to superstitious beliefs. To gain this answer, it is only needful to find what precisely was the especial mark of Jesus which has led so many people to raise Him above the rest of men, and, for eighteen hundred years, to hold Him as a God.

He who would solve this problem, it would seem, must, before all, bring himself to understand the teaching of Jesus: His true teaching, clearly seen, and not the crude interpretations which have been put upon it. But this is just what is neglected. The learned historians of Christianity are so satisfied to think that Jesus was no God, they are so keen to prove that His teaching holds nothing divine, and is, therefore, not binding, that they are not alive to a very plain fact: they do not see that, the more they prove Jesus to have been simply a man, and in nothing divine, the darker and more insoluble they make the problem they have in hand. They are

making their full efforts to prove that He was simply a man, that, therefore, His teaching is not obligatory. To see clearly this astonishing error, one has only to remember the last writings of Renan's follower, M. Havet, who remarks, with much simplicity, "Christ was never, in anything, a Christian." And M. Soury, for his part, is altogether ravished with the idea that Jesus was a cultureless man, a simple soul.

The essential thing is : not to prove that Jesus was no God, and His doctrine not divine, any more than to prove He was not a Catholic : but to know what His teaching essentially is ; that teaching which has seemed to men so lofty and so precious, that they have again and again owned Him for God who gave it to them.

If the reader belongs to that vast body of educated men who have been brought up in the beliefs of a Church, and who have not renounced its absurdities ; if he be a man of reason and conscience (whether retaining love and respect for the Christian teaching, or whether, following the proverb, "Burn the coat now the vermin have got in," he thinks the whole of Christianity a pernicious superstition), I pray him to reflect that that which shocks him, and seems to him a superstition, is not the real teaching of Jesus ; and that it were unjust to make Jesus responsible for the follies which have, since His time, incrustated His teaching. It is only necessary to study the teaching of Jesus in its proper form, as it has come down to us in the words and deeds which are recorded as His own. With readers of the kind I have addressed, my book will go to show that Christianity is not only a mixture of things sublime and things base ; that it is not only not a superstition, but that, on the contrary, it is the most convincing presentment of metaphysics and morals, the purest and most complete doctrine of life, and the highest light which the human mind has ever reached ; a doctrine from which all the noblest activities of humanity in politics, science, poetry, and philosophy instinctively derive themselves.

If, on the other hand, my reader belongs to that small minority of educated men who remain attached to Church

doctrines, and who accept religion, not for an outward end, but to gain inward quietude, then I ask such a reader to remember that the teaching of Christ, as set forth herein, is quite other than that teaching as he has been given to understand it; and that, therefore, the question for him is, not as to whether the doctrine here put before him agrees with his beliefs, but, as to which is more in harmony with his reason and his heart—the teaching of his Church composed of reconcilements of many scriptures, or the pure teaching of Jesus. It concerns him only to decide whether he will accept the new teaching, or whether he prefers to retain the teaching of his Church.

If, finally, my reader belongs to the category of men who value and accept outwardly the belief of some Church, not at all for truth's sake, but for the outward consideration of gains that come therefrom, such an one should inform himself that, whatever be the number of his coreligionists, whatever their power, whatever their station, even though monarchs, and whatever lofty personages they can reckon among them, he himself forms one of a party, not of the accusers, but of the accused. Such readers should inform themselves that they are not asked to furnish arguments for their case, because, this long while, all such arguments have been given which can be given; and even should they cite their proofs, they would only prove that which every one of the hundreds of opposing sects proves in its own case.

And, in truth, such people need not to prove anything, but to clear themselves, first, of the sacrilege they commit in putting the teaching of Jesus, whom they hold to be God, upon the same footing as the teachings of Ezra, of the Councils, of Theophylact; and in allowing themselves to distort the sayings of God into agreement with the sayings of men. Again, they must clear themselves of blasphemy in ascribing to God-Jesus all the zealotry which abides in their own hearts, and declaring it to be teaching of Christ. And finally, they must clear themselves of the treason they commit in hiding from men the teaching of God, who has come

down to earth to bring us salvation ; and by sliding in, to displace this teaching, the tradition of the Holy Spirit, thus depriving thousands of millions of that salvation which Jesus brought for men ; and thus, instead of peace and love, bringing in all the diversity of sects, and all the recriminations, murders, and all sorts of misdeeds which follow.

For these readers there are only two issues : either to make humble submission, and renounce their deceits ; or, to persecute those who arise to accuse them of the evil they have done and are doing.

If they will not renounce their deceits, it remains for them to take the only other part, that is, to persecute me. For which, in now completing my writing, I am prepared, with joy, and with fear for my own human weakness.

THE GOSPEL IN BRIEF

CHAPTER I

THE SON OF GOD

Man, the son of God, is powerless in the flesh, and free in the spirit

(“Our Father”)

- Mt. i. 18. **T**HE birth of Jesus Christ was thus:—
His mother Mary was betrothed to Joseph. But, before they began to live as man
19. and wife, Mary proved with child. But Joseph
was a good man, and did not wish to disgrace
24. her; he took her as his wife, and had nothing
25. to do with her until she had borne her first son,
and called him Jesus.
- Lk. ii. 40. And the boy grew and matured, and was
intelligent beyond his years.
41. Jesus was twelve years old; and it happened
42. that Mary and Joseph went to the feast at
43. Jerusalem, and took the boy with them. The
44. feast was over, and they went homeward, and
forgot about the boy. Afterward they recol-
45. lected, and thought that he had gone off with
the children, and they inquired about him along
the road. He was nowhere to be found, and
46. they went back to Jerusalem after him. And
it was the third day before they found the boy
in the temple, sitting with the teachers, ques-
47. tioning them, and listening. And every one
48. wondered at his intelligence. His mother
caught sight of him, and said: “Why have

you done this way with us? Your father and I have been grieving, and looking for you."

And he said to them: "But where did you look for me? Surely you ought to know that the son must be looked for in his Father's house?" And they did not understand his words; they did not understand whom it was he called his Father. Lk. ii. 49.
50.

And after this, Jesus lived at his mother's, and obeyed her in everything. And he advanced in age and intelligence. And every one thought that Jesus was the son of Joseph; and so he lived to the age of thirty. 51.
52.
iii. 23.

At that time the prophet John appeared in Judea. He lived in the desert of Judea, on the Jordan. John's clothes were of camel's hair, girt round the waist with a strap; and he fed on bark and herbs. Mt. iii. 1.
Mk. i. 4.
Mt. iii. 4.

He summoned the people to a change of life, in order to get rid of wickedness; and, as a sign of the change of life, he bathed people in the Jordan. He said: "A voice calls to you: Open a way for God through the wild places, clear the way for Him. Make it so that all may be level, that there may be neither hollows nor hills, neither high nor low. Then God will be among you, and all will find their salvation." Mk. i. 4.
Lk. iii. 4.
5.
6.

And the people asked him, "What are we to do?" He answered: "Let him who has two suits of clothes give one to him who has none. Let him who has food give to him who has none." And tax-collectors came to him, and asked: "What are we to do?" He said to them: "Extort nothing beyond what is ordered." And soldiers asked: "How are we to live?" He said: "Do no one any harm, do not deal falsely; be content with what is served out to you." 10.
11.
12.
13.
14.

And inhabitants of Jerusalem came to him, Mt. iii. 5.

and all the Jews in the neighborhood of the
 Mt. iii. 6. Jordan. And they acknowledged their wickedness to him; and, in sign of the change of life, he bathed them in the Jordan.

7. And many of the orthodox and conventional religionists also came to John, but secretly. He recognized them, and said: "You race of vipers!

8. Have you, also, got wind of it, that you cannot escape the will of God? Then bethink yourselves, and change your faith! And if you wish to change your faith, let it be seen by your fruits that you have bethought yourselves.

10. The ax is already laid to the tree. If the tree produces bad fruit, it will be cut down

11. and cast into the fire. In sign of your change I cleanse you in water; but, along with this bathing, you must be cleansed with the spirit.

12. The spirit will cleanse you, as a master cleanses his threshing-floor; when he gathers the wheat, but burns the chaff."

13. Jesus came from Galilee to the Jordan to be bathed by John; and he bathed, and heard John's preaching.

iv. 1. And from the Jordan he went into the wild
 2. places, and there he strove in the spirit. Jesus passed forty days and nights in the desert, without food or drink.

Lk. iv. 3. And the voice of his flesh said to him: "If you were Son of the Almighty God, you might of your own will make loaves out of stones; but you cannot do this, therefore you are not

4. Son of God." But Jesus said to himself: "If I cannot make bread out of stones, this means that I am not Son of a God of the flesh, but Son of the God of the spirit. I am alive, not by bread, but by the spirit. And my spirit is able to disregard the flesh."

But hunger, nevertheless, tormented him; and the voice of the flesh again said to him: "If you live only by the spirit, and can disre-

gard the flesh, then you can throw off the flesh, and your spirit will remain alive." And it seemed to him that he was standing on the roof of the temple, and the voice of the flesh said to him: "If you are Son of the God of the spirit, throw yourself off the temple. You will not be killed. But an unforeseen force will keep you, support you, and save you from all harm." But Jesus said to himself: "I can disregard the flesh, but may not throw it off, because I was born by the spirit into the flesh. This was the will of the Father of my spirit, and I cannot oppose Him."

Lk. iv. 9.

10.

11.
12.

Then the voice of the flesh said to him: "If you cannot oppose your Father by throwing yourself off the temple and discarding life, then you also cannot oppose your Father by hungering when you need to eat. You must not make light of the desires of the flesh; they were placed in you, and you must serve them." Then Jesus seemed to see all the kingdoms of the earth, and all mankind, just as they live and labor for the flesh, expecting gain therefrom. And the voice of the flesh said to him: "Well, you see, these work for me, and I give them all they wish for. If you will work for me you will have the same." But Jesus said to himself: "My Father is not flesh, but spirit. I live by Him; I always know that He is in me. Him alone I honor, and for Him alone I work, expecting reward from Him alone."

5.

6.

7.

8.

Then the temptation ceased, and Jesus knew the power of the spirit.

13.

And when he had known the power of the spirit, Jesus went out of the wild places, and went again to John, and stayed with him.

14.

Jn. i. 35.

And when Jesus was leaving John, John said of him: "This is the saviour of men."

36.

On account of these words of John, two of John's disciples left their former teacher and

37.

- Jn. 1. 38. went after Jesus. Jesus, seeing them following him, stopped and said: "What do you want?" They said to him: "Teacher! we wish to be with you, and to know your teaching." 39. He said: "Come with me, and I will tell you everything." They went with him, and stayed with him, listening to him until the tenth hour.
40. One of these disciples was called Andrew. 41. Andrew had a brother Simon. Having heard Jesus, Andrew went to his brother Simon, and said to him: "We have found him of whom the prophets wrote, the Messiah; we have found him who has announced to us our salvation." 42. Andrew took Simon with him, and brought him also to Jesus. Jesus called this brother of Andrew, Peter, which means a stone. And both these brothers became disciples of Jesus.
43. Afterward, before entering Galilee, Jesus met Philip, and called him to go with him. 44. Philip was from Bethsaida, and a fellow-villager of Peter and Andrew. 45. When Philip knew Jesus, he went and found his brother Nathanael, and said to him: "We have found the chosen of God, of whom the prophets and Moses wrote. This is Jesus, the son of Joseph, 46. from Nazareth." Nathanael was astonished that he of whom the prophets wrote should be from the neighboring village, and said: "It is most unlikely that the messenger of God 47. should be from Nazareth." Philip said: "Come with me, you shall see and hear for yourself." 48. Nathanael agreed, and went with his brother, and met Jesus; and, when he had heard him, 49. he said to Jesus: "Yes, now I see that this is true, that you are the Son of God and the king of Israel." 50. Jesus said to him: "Learn something more important than that. Henceforth heaven is opened, and people may be in com-

munion with the forces of heaven. Henceforth God will be no longer separate from men."

And Jesus came home to Nazareth; and on the Sabbath he went as usual into the synagogue, and began to read. They gave him the book of the prophet Isaiah, and, unrolling it, he began to read. In the book was written:—

"The spirit of the Lord is in me. He has chosen me to announce happiness to the unfortunate and the broken-hearted, to announce freedom to those who are bound, light to the blind, and salvation and rest to the weary. To announce to all men the time of God's mercy."

He folded the book, gave it to the attendant, and sat down. And all waited to hear what he should say. And he said: "This writing has now been fulfilled before your eyes."

CHAPTER II

LIFE IN THE SPIRIT

Therefore man must work, not for the flesh, but for the spirit

("Which art in heaven")

It happened once that Jesus, with his disciples, went through a field on the Sabbath. His disciples were hungry, and on the way plucked ears of corn, bruised them in their hands, and ate the grain. But, according to the teaching of the orthodox, God had made an agreement with Moses, that all should observe the Sabbath, and do nothing on that day. According to this teaching of the orthodox, God commanded that he who worked on the Sabbath should be stoned to death. The orthodox saw that the disciples were bruising ears of corn on the Sabbath, and said; "It is not

Lk. iv. 16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

Mt. xii. 1.

Mk. ii. 23.

Lk. vi. 1.

Mt. xii. 2

right to do so on the Sabbath. One must not work on the Sabbath, and you are bruising ears of corn. God ordained the Sabbath, and commanded the breaking of it should be punished with death." Jesus heard this, and said:

Mt. xii. 7. "If you understand what is the meaning of God's words, 'I desire love, and not sacrifice,' you would not attach blame to that which is
8. not blameworthy. Man is more important than the Sabbath."

Lk. xiii. 10. It happened another time, on a Sabbath, that
• 11. when Jesus was teaching in the synagogue, a sick woman came up to him and asked him to
12-14. help her. And Jesus began to cure her. Then the orthodox church-elder was angry with Jesus for this, and said to the people: "It is said in the law of God: There are six days in the week
xiv. 3. on which to work." But Jesus, in reply, asked the orthodox professors of the law: "Well, then, in your opinion, may not one help a man
6. on the Sabbath?" And they did not know
5. what to answer. Then Jesus said: "Deceiv-

Lk. xiii. 15. ers! Does not each of you untie his beast from the manger and lead him to water on the
Mt. xii. 11. Sabbath? And if his sheep falls into a well, any one will run and drag it out, although even
12. on the Sabbath. And a man is much better than a sheep. But you say that one must not
Mk. iii. 4. help a man. What, then, in your opinion, must one do on the Sabbath, good or evil: save a soul or destroy it? Good must be done always, on the Sabbath too."

Mt. ix. 9. Jesus once saw a tax-gatherer receiving taxes. The tax-gatherer was called Matthew. Jesus began to speak with him, and Matthew understood him, liked his teaching, and invited him to his house, and showed him hospitality.
10. When Jesus came to Matthew, there came also Matthew's friends, tax-gatherers and unbelievers, and Jesus did not disdain them, and sat

down, he and his disciples. And the orthodox saw this, and said to Jesus' disciples: "How is it that your teacher eats with tax-gatherers and unbelievers?" According to the teaching of the orthodox, God forbade communion with unbelievers. Jesus heard, and said: "He who is satisfied with his health does not need a doctor, but he who is ill, does. Understand what is the meaning of God's words: 'I desire love and not sacrifice.' I cannot teach a change of faith to those who consider themselves orthodox, but I teach those who consider themselves unbelievers."

There came to Jesus orthodox professors of the law from Jerusalem. And they saw that his disciples and Jesus himself ate bread with unwashed hands; and these orthodox began to condemn him for this, because they themselves strictly observed, according to church tradition, how plates and dishes should be washed, and would not eat unless they had been so washed. Also, they would eat nothing from the market unless they had washed it.

And the orthodox professors of the law asked him: "Why do you live not according to church tradition, but take and eat bread with unwashed hands?" And he answered them: "But in what way do you break God's commandment, following your church tradition? God said to you: 'Honor your father and mother.' But you have twisted it so that every one can say: 'I give to God what I used to give my parents.' And he who so says need not support his father and mother. Thus, then, you break God's commandment by church tradition. Deceivers! The prophet Isaiah spoke the truth about you: 'Because this people only fall down before me in words, and honor me with their tongue, while their heart is far from me; and because their fear of me is only a human law which

Mt. ix. 11.

12.

13.

xv. 1.
Mk. vii. 1.
Mt. xv. 2.
Mk. vii. 2.

3.

4.

5.

Mt. xv. 3.

Mk. vii. 10,
11.

12.

13.

Mt. xv. 7.

8.

9.

they have learnt by heart; therefore I will perform a wonderful, an extraordinary thing upon this people: The wisdom of its wise men shall be lost, and the reason of its thinkers shall be dimmed. Woe to them who take thought to hide their desires from the Eternal, and who do their deeds in darkness.' And so it is with you: You leave that which is important in the law, that which is God's commandment, and observe your human tradition as to the washing of cups!"

Mk. vii. 8.

14. And Jesus called the people to him, and
15. said: "Hearken all, and understand: There is nothing in the world that, entering a man, could defile him; but that which goes forth from him, this defiles a man. Let love and mercy be in your soul, and then all will be
16. clean. Try to understand this."

17. And when he returned home, his disciples
18. asked him: "What do these words mean?" And he said: "Do you also not understand this? Do you not understand that everything external, that which is of the flesh, cannot de-
19. file a man? The reason is, it enters not his soul, but his body. It enters the body, and
20. afterward goes out from it. Only that can defile a man which goes out from the man
21. himself, from his soul. Because from the soul of man proceed evil, fornication, impurity, murder, theft, covetousness, wrath, deceit, insolence, envy, calumny, pride, and every kind of folly.
23. All this evil is out of the soul of man and it alone can defile a man."

Jn. ii. 13. After this, the Passover came, and Jesus went to Jerusalem, and entered the temple.

14. In the inclosure of the temple stood cattle, cows, bulls, rams; and there were cotes full of pigeons, and money-changers behind their counters. All this was necessary in order to make offerings to God. The animals were

slaughtered and offered in the temple. This was the method of prayer among the Jews, as taught by the orthodox professors of the law. Jesus went into the temple, twisted a whip, drove all the cattle out of the inclosure, and set free all the doves. And he scattered all the money, and bade that none of this should be brought into the temple. He said: "The prophet Isaiah said to you: The house of God is not the temple in Jerusalem, but the whole world of God's people. And the prophet Jeremiah also told you: Do not believe the falsehoods that here is the house of the Eternal. Do not believe this, but change your life; do not judge falsely; do not oppress the stranger, the widow, and the orphan; do not shed innocent blood, and do not come into the house of God, and say: Now we may quietly do foul deeds. Do not make my house a den of robbers."

And the Jews began to dispute, and said to him: "You say that our piety is wrong. By what proofs will you show this?" And, turning to them, Jesus said: "Destroy this temple and I will in three days awaken a new, living temple." And the Jews said: "But how will you at once make a new temple, when this was forty-six years in building?" And Jesus said to them: "I speak to you of that which is more important than the temple. You would not say this if you understood the meaning of the words of the prophet: I, God, do not rejoice at your offerings, but rejoice at your love to each other. The living temple is the whole world of men, when they love each other."

And then in Jerusalem many people believed in what he said. But he himself believed in nothing external, because he knew that everything is within man. He had no need that any one should give witness of man, because he knew that in man is the spirit.

Jn. ii. 15

16.

Mt. xxi. 13.

Mk. xi. 17.

(Isa. lvi. 7.

Jer. vii. 4,
11.)

18.

19.

20.

Mt. xii. 6.

7.

Jn. ii. 23.

24.

25.

Jn. **iv.** **4.** And Jesus happened once to be passing
5. through Samaria. He passed by the Samaritan
village of Sychar, near the place which Jacob
6. gave to his son Joseph. There was Jacob's
well. Jesus was tired, and sat beside the well.
8. His disciples went into the town to fetch bread.
7. And a woman came from Sychar to draw water,
9. and Jesus asked her to give him to drink. And
she said to him : " How is it that you ask me to
give you to drink ? For you Jews have no inter-
course with us Samaritans."

10. But he said to her : " If you knew me, and
knew what I teach, you would not say this, and
you would give me to drink, and I would give
13. you the water of life. Whoever drinks of the
14. water you have will thirst again. But whoever
shall drink of the water I have shall always be
satisfied, and this water shall bring him ever-
19. lasting life." The woman understood that he
was speaking of things divine, and said to him :
" I see that you are a prophet, and wish to teach
20. me. But how are you to teach me divine things,
when you are a Jew and I a Samaritan? Our
people worship God upon this hill, but you Jews
say that the house of God is only in Jerusalem.
You cannot teach me divine things, because you
have one belief, and we another." And Jesus
21. said to her : " Believe me, woman, the time is
already here, when people, to pray to the Father,
23. will come neither to this hill nor to Jerusalem.
The time has come when the real worshipers
of God will worship the Heavenly Father in
24. spirit and with works. Such are the worship-
ers the Father needs. God is a spirit, and He
must be worshiped in the spirit and with
25. works." The woman did not understand what
he told her, and said : I have heard that the
messenger of God will come, he whom they call
the anointed. He will then declare every-
26. thing." And Jesus said to her : " It is I, the

same who has spoken with you. Expect nothing more."

After this, Jesus came into the land of Judea, and there lived with his disciples, and taught. At that time John taught the people near Salim, and bathed them in the river Enon. For John was not yet put in prison.

And a dispute arose between the disciples of John and the hearers of Jesus, as to which was better, John's cleansing in water or Jesus' teaching. And they came to John, and said to him: "You cleanse with water, but Jesus only teaches, and all go to him. What have you to say of him?" John said: "A man of himself can teach nothing, unless God teach him. Who speaks of the earth, is of the earth; but whosoever speaks of God, is from God. It is no-wise possible to prove whether the words that are spoken are from God or not from God. God is a spirit; He cannot be measured, and He cannot be proved. He who shall understand the word of the spirit, by this very thing proves that he is of the spirit. The Father, loving His Son, has intrusted all to him. Whoever believes in the Son has life, and whoever does not believe in the Son has not life. God is the spirit in man."

After this there came to Jesus one of the orthodox, and invited him to dinner. Jesus went in and sat down at table. The host noticed that he did not wash before dinner, and wondered thereat. And Jesus said to him: "You orthodox wash everything outside; but are you clean inside? Be well-disposed to men, and all will be clean."

And while he sat in the house of the orthodox, there came a woman of the town, who was an unbeliever. She had learnt that Jesus was in the house of the orthodox man, and she came there too, bringing a bottle of scent. And she

Jn. iii. 22

23.

24.

25.

26.

27.

31.

32-34.

35.

36.

Lk. xi. 37.

38.

39-41.

vii. 37.

38

- knelt at his feet, wept, and washed his feet with her tears, wiped them with her hair, and poured scent over them. The orthodox man saw this, and thought to himself: "He is hardly a prophet. If he were really a prophet, he would know what kind of a woman it is that is washing his feet. He would know that this is a wrong-doer, and would not allow her to touch him." Jesus guessed his thought, and, turning to him, said: "Shall I tell you what I think?"
- The host assented. And Jesus said: "Well, it is this. Two men held themselves debtors to a certain man of property, one for five hundred pence, the other for fifty. And neither the one nor the other had anything to pay with. The creditor pardoned both. Now, in your opinion, which will love the creditor more, and show him greater attention? And he said: "Of course, he that owed more." Jesus pointed to the woman, and said: "So it is with you and this woman. You consider yourself orthodox, and therefore a small debtor; she considers herself an unbeliever, and therefore a great debtor. I came to your house; you did not give me water to wash my feet. She washed my feet with her tears, and wiped them with her hair. You did not kiss me, but she kissed my feet. You did not give me oil to anoint my head, but she anoints my feet with precious scent. He who rests in orthodoxy will not do works of love, but he who considers himself an unbeliever will do works of love. And for works of love, all is forgiven." And he said to her: "All your wickedness is forgiven you." And Jesus said: "All depends upon what each man considers himself. Whoever considers himself good will not be good; but whoever considers himself bad will become good."
- And Jesus said further: "Two men once came into a temple to pray; one orthodox, and

the other a tax-gatherer. The orthodox man Lk xviii. 11
 prayed thus : ' I thank Thee, God, that I am not
 as other men, I am not a miser, nor a libertine ;
 I am not a rogue, not such a worthless fellow as
 that tax-gatherer. I fast twice weekly, and give 12.
 away a tithe of my property.' But the tax- 13.
 gatherer stood afar off, and dared not look up
 at the sky, but merely beat his breast, and said :
 ' Lord, look down upon me, worthless as I am.'
 Well, and this man was better than the ortho- 14.
 dox, for the reason that whoever exalts him-
 self shall be humbled, and whoever humbles
 himself shall be exalted."

After this, disciples of John came to Jesus, v. 33.
 and said : " Why do we and the orthodox fast
 much, while your disciples do not fast ? For,
 according to the law, God commanded people
 to fast." And Jesus said to them : " While 34
 the bridegroom is at the wedding, no one
 grieves. Only when the bridegroom is away, 35.
 do people grieve. Having life, one must not 36.
 grieve. The external worship of God cannot
 be combined with works of love. The old
 teaching of the external worship of God can-
 not be combined with my teaching of works
 of love to one's neighbor. To combine my
 teaching with the old, is the same as to tear
 off a shred from a new garment and sew it on
 an old one. You will tear the new and not
 mend the old. Either all my teaching must
 be accepted, or all the old. And having once
 accepted my teaching, it is impossible to keep
 the old teaching, of purification, fasting, and
 the Sabbath. Just as new wine cannot be 37.
 poured into old skins, or the old skins will
 burst and the wine run out. But new wine 38.
 must be poured into new skins, and both the
 one and the other will remain whole."

CHAPTER III

THE SOURCE OF LIFE

The life of all men has proceeded from the spirit of the Father

(“Hallowed be Thy Name”)

- Mt. xi. 2.** AFTER this, John's disciples came to ask
3. Jesus whether it was he of whom John spoke ;
4. whether he was revealing the kingdom of God,
and renewing men by the spirit? Jesus answered and said: “Look, listen, — and tell John, whether the kingdom of God has begun, and whether people are being renewed by the spirit. Tell him of what kingdom of God I
5. am preaching. It is said in the prophecies that, when the kingdom of God shall come, all men will be blessed. Well, tell him that
6. my kingdom of God is such that the poor are blessed, and that every one who understands me becomes blessed.”
7. And, having dismissed John's disciples, Jesus began to speak to the people as to the kingdom of God John announced. He said: “When you went to John in the wilderness to be baptized, what did you go to see? The orthodox teachers of the law also went, but did not understand that which John announced.
16. And they thought him nothing worth. This breed of orthodox teachers of the law only consider that as truth which they themselves invent and hear from each other, and that as law which they themselves have devised. But
18. that which John said, that which I say, they do not hearken to, and do not understand. Of that which John says, they have understood only that he fasts in the wild places, and
19. they say: ‘In him is an evil spirit.’ Of that which I say, they have understood only that

I do not fast, and they say: 'He eats and drinks with tax-gatherers and sinners—he is a friend of theirs.' They chatter with each other like children in the street, and wonder that no one listens to them. And their wisdom is seen by their works. If you went to John to look at a man attired in rich clothes, why, such dwell here in palaces. Then, what did you go to seek in the desert? Did you go because you think John was the same as other prophets? Do not think this. John was not a prophet like others. He was greater than all prophets. They foretold that which might be. He has announced to men that which is, namely, that the kingdom of God was, and is, on earth. Verily, I tell you, a man has not been born greater than John. He has declared the kingdom of God on earth, and therefore he is higher than all. The law and the prophets,—all this was needful before John. But, from John and to the present time, it is announced that the kingdom of God is on earth, and that he who makes an effort enters into it."

And the orthodox came to Jesus, and began asking him: "How, then, and when, will the kingdom of God come?" And he answered them: "The kingdom of God which I preach is not such as former prophets preached. They said that God would come with divers visible signs, but I speak of a kingdom of God, the coming of which may not be seen with the eyes. And if any one shall say to you, 'See, it is come, or it shall come,' or, 'See, it is here or there,' do not believe them. The kingdom of God is not in time, or in place, of any kind. It is like lightning, seen here, there, and everywhere. And it has neither time nor place, because the kingdom of God, the one which I preach, is within you."

17

19.

8.

9

10.

Lk. xvi. 16.

xvii. 20.

24

21

- iii. 1. After this, an orthodox believer, one of the
 2. Jewish authorities, named Nicodemus, came to Jesus at night, and said: "You do not bid us keep the Sabbath, do not bid us observe cleanliness, do not bid us make offerings, nor fast; you would destroy the temple. You say of God, He is a spirit, and you say of the kingdom of God, that it is within us. Then, what kind of a kingdom of God is this?"
3. And Jesus answered him: "Understand that, if man is conceived from heaven, then in him there must be that which is of heaven."
- Nicodemus did not understand this, and said: "How can a man, if he is conceived of the flesh of his father, and has grown old, again enter the womb of his mother and be conceived anew?"
5. And Jesus answered him: "Understand what I say. I say that man, besides the flesh, is also conceived of the spirit, and therefore every man is conceived of flesh and spirit, and therefore may the kingdom of heaven be in
 6. him. From flesh comes flesh. From flesh,
 7. spirit cannot be born; spirit can come only
 8. from spirit. The spirit is that which lives in you, and lives in freedom and reason; it is that of which you know neither the beginning nor the end, and which every man feels in him.
 9. And, therefore, why do you wonder that I told you we must be conceived from heaven?"
9. Nicodemus said: "Still I do not believe that this can be so."
10. Then Jesus said to him: "What kind of a teacher are you, if you do not comprehend
 11. this? Understand that I am not interpreting some learned points; I am interpreting that which we all know, I am averring that which
 12. we all see. How will you believe in that which is in heaven if you do not believe in that which is on earth, which is in you yourself?"

“For, no man has ever gone up to heaven, Jn. iii. 13
 but there is only man on earth, come down
 from heaven, and himself of heaven. Now, 14.
 this same heavenly Son in man it is that must
 be lifted up, that every one may believe in him 15.
 and not perish, but may have heavenly life.
 For God gave His Son, of the same essence 16.
 as Himself, not for men’s destruction, but for
 their happiness. He gave him in order that
 every one might believe in him, and might not
 perish, but have life without end. For He did 17.
 not bring forth His Son, this life, into the world
 of men in order to destroy the world of men ;
 but He brought forth His Son, this life, in order
 that the world of men might be made alive
 through him.

“Whoever commits his life to him does not 18.
 die ; but he who does not commit his life to
 him destroys himself thereby, in that he has
 not trusted to that which is life. Death con- 19.
 sists in this, that life is come into the world,
 but men themselves go away from life.

“Light is the life of men ; light came into
 the world, but men prefer the darkness to
 light, and do not go to the light. He who
 does wrong does not go to the light, so that
 his deeds may not be seen, and such a one
 bereaves himself of life. Whereas he who 20.
 lives in truth goes to the light, so that his
 deeds are seen ; and he has life, and is united
 with God. 21.

“The kingdom of God must be understood,
 not, as you think, in the sense that it will come
 for all men at some time or other, and in some
 place or other, but thus, — In the whole world
 always, some people, those who trust in the
 heavenly Son of man, become sons of the king-
 dom, but others who do not trust in him are de-
 stroyed. The Father of that spirit which is in
 man is the Father of those only who acknowl-

edge themselves to be His sons. And, therefore, only those exist to Him who have kept in themselves that which He gave them."

Mt. xiii. 3. And, after this, Jesus began to explain to the people what the kingdom of God is, and he made this clear by means of parables.

He said: "The Father,—who is spirit,—sows in the world the life of understanding, as the husbandman sows seed in his field. He sows over the whole field, without remarking where any particular seed falls. Some seeds fall upon the road, and the birds fly down and peck them up. And others fall among stones; and although among these stones they come up, they wither, because there is no room for the roots. And others, again, fall among wormwood, so that the wormwood chokes the corn, and the ear springs up, but does not fill. And others fall on good soil; they spring up, and make return for the lost corn, and bear ears, and fill, and one ear will give a hundredfold, another sixtyfold, and another thirtyfold. Thus, then, God also sowed broadcast the spirit in men; in some it is lost, but in others it yields a hundredfold: these last are they who form the kingdom of God. Thus the kingdom is not such as you think, that God will come to reign over you. God has only sown the spirit, and the kingdom of God will be in those who preserve it.

Mk. iv. 26. "God does not force men. It is as when the sower casts the seeds in the earth, and himself thinks no more of them; but the seeds of themselves swell, sprout up, put forth leaf, sheath, and ear, and fill with grain. Only when it is ripened, the master sends sickles to reap the cornfield. So also God gave His Son, the spirit, to the world; and the spirit of itself grows in the world, and the sons of the spirit make up the kingdom of God.

A woman puts yeast in the kneading trough and mixes it with the flour; she then stirs it no more, but lets it ferment and rise. As long as men live, God does not interpose in their life. He gave the spirit to the world, and the spirit itself lives in men, and men who live by the spirit make up the kingdom of God. For the spirit there is neither death nor evil. Death and evil are for the flesh, but not for the spirit. Mt. xlii. 33

The kingdom of God comes in this way. A farmer sowed good seed in his field. The farmer is the Spirit, the Father; the field is the world; the good seeds are the sons of the kingdom of God. And the farmer lay down to sleep, and an enemy came and sowed darnel in the field. The enemy is temptation; the darnel is the sons of temptation. And his laborers came to the farmer and said: "Can you have sown bad seed?" Much darnel has come up in your field. Send us, we will weed it out." And the farmer said: "You must not do that, for in weeding the darnel you will trample the wheat. Let them grow together. The harvest will come, when I shall bid the reapers take away the darnel and burn it; and the wheat I shall store in the barn." 24.
25.
27.
28.
29.
30.

Now, the harvest is the end of man's life, and the harvesters are the power of heaven. And the darnel shall be burnt, but the wheat shall be cleaned and gathered. Thus also, at life's end, all shall vanish which was a guile of time, and the true life in the spirit shall alone be left. For the Spirit, the Father, there is no evil. The spirit keeps that which it needs, and that which is not of it does not exist for it.

The kingdom of God is like a net. The net will be spread in the sea, and will catch all kinds of fish. And afterward, when it is drawn out, the worthless will be set aside and thrown into the sea. So will it be at the end 47.
48

of the age; the powers of heaven will take the good, and the evil will be cast away.

Mt. xiii. 10. And when he finished speaking, the disciples asked him how to understand these parables?

11. And he said to them: "These parables must be understood in two ways. I speak all these parables because there are some like you, my disciples, who understand wherein is the kingdom of God, who understand that the kingdom of God is within every man, who understand how to go into it; while others do not understand this. Others look, but see not; they hearken, and do not understand, because their
14. heart has become gross. Therefore I speak these parables with two meanings, for both classes of hearers. To the others I speak of God, of what God's kingdom is to them, and they may understand this; while to you I speak of what the kingdom of God is for you — that kingdom which is within you.

18. "And see that you understand as you ought
19. the parable of the sower. For you the parable is this: Every one who has understood the meaning of the kingdom of God, but has not accepted it in his heart, to him temptation comes and robs him of that which has been
20. sown: this is the seed on the wayside. That which was sown on stones, is he who at once
21. accepts with joy. But there is no root in him, and he only accepts for a time; but let straits and persecution befall him, because of the meaning of the kingdom, and he straightway
22. denies it. That which was sown among the wormwood is he who understood the meaning of the kingdom, but worldly cares and the seductions of wealth strangle the meaning
23. in him, and he yields no fruit. But that which was sown on good soil is he who understood the meaning of the kingdom, and accepted it into his heart; such yield fruit, one a hundred-

fold, another sixtyfold, another thirtyfold. For Mt. xiii. 12.
 he who retains, to him much is given; while
 from him who does not retain, the whole will
 be taken.

“And, therefore, take care how you under- Lk. viii. 18.
 stand these parables. Understand them so as
 not to give way to deceit, wrong, and care;
 but so as to yield thirtyfold, or sixtyfold, or a
 hundredfold.

“The kingdom of heaven grows and spreads Mt. xiii. 31.
 in the soul out of nothing, providing every-
 thing. It is like a birch seed, the very small-
 est of seeds, which, when it grows up, becomes
 greater than all other trees, and the birds of
 heaven build their nests in it.”

CHAPTER IV

GOD'S KINGDOM

*Therefore the will of the Father is the life and welfare of
 all men*

(“Thy kingdom come”)

AND Jesus went among the towns and vil- Mt. ix. 35.
 lages, and taught all men the happiness of ful-
 filling the Father's will. Jesus was sorry for 36.
 men, that they perish without knowing wherein
 is the true life, and are driven about and suffer,
 without knowing why, like sheep left without
 a shepherd.

Once a crowd of people gathered to Jesus, v. 1.
 to hear his teaching; and he went up on a hill
 and sat down. His disciples surrounded him.

And Jesus began to teach the people as to 2.
 what is the Father's will. He said:—

Blessed are the poor and homeless, for they Lk. vi. 20,
 are in the will of the Father. Even if they 21.
 hunger for a time, they shall be satisfied; and

Lk. vi. 22. if they grieve and weep, they shall be comforted. If people look down upon them, and thrust them aside and everywhere drive them
23. away, let them be glad at this; for the people of God have ever been persecuted thus, and they receive a heavenly reward.

24. But woe to the rich, for they have already got everything they wish, and will get nothing more. They are now satisfied; but they
25. shall be hungry. Now they are merry; but
26. they shall be sad. If all praise them, woe to them, because only deceivers get everybody's praise.

Blessed are the poor and homeless, but blessed only then, when they are poor, not merely externally, but in spirit; as salt is good only when it is true salt; not externally only, but when it has the savor of salt.

Mt. v. 13. So, you also, the poor and homeless, are the teachers of the world; you are blessed, if you know that true happiness is in being homeless and poor. But if you are poor only externally, then you, like salt without savor, are good for
14. nothing. You must be a light to the world; therefore do not hide your light, but show it to
15. men. For when one lights a candle, one does not put it under a bench, but upon the table,
16. that it may light all in the room. So, you also, do not hide your light, but show it by your works, so that men may see that you know the truth, and, looking at your good works, may understand your Heavenly Father.

17. And do not think that I free you from the law. I teach not release from the law, but I teach
18. the fulfilment of the eternal law. As long as there are men under heaven, there is an everlasting law. There will be no law, only when men shall of themselves act wholly according to the eternal law. And now I am giving you
19. the commandments of the eternal law. And

if any one shall release himself, if only from one of these short commandments, and shall teach others that they may so release themselves, he shall be least in the kingdom of heaven; while he who shall fulfil them, and shall thereby teach others, shall be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. Because if your virtue be not greater Mt. v. 20. than the virtue of the orthodox leaders, you will in no way be in the kingdom of heaven.

These are the commandments:—

I

In the former law it was said: "Do not kill." But if any one shall kill another, he must be judged. 21.

But I tell you, that every one is worthy of judgment who gets angry with his brother. And still more to blame is he who abuses his brother. 22.

So that, if you wish to pray to God, remember, first, whether there is no man who may have something against you. If you remember that but one man considers you have offended him, leave your prayer, and go first and make peace with your brother; and then you may pray. Know that God wants neither sacrifice nor prayer, but peace, concord, and love among you. And you may neither pray, nor think of God, if there is but one man to whom you do not bear love. 23.
24.

And so this is the first commandment: Do not be angry, do not abuse; but having quarreled, make peace in such a way that no one may have cause for offense against you.

II

Mt. v. 31. In the former law it was said: "Do not commit adultery; and if you wish to put away your wife, give her a bill of divorce."

28. But I tell you, if you are drawn by the beauty of a woman, you are already committing adultery. All sensuality destroys the soul, and therefore it is better for you to renounce the pleasure of the flesh than to destroy your life.

32. And if you put away your wife, then, besides being vicious yourself, you drive her also into vice, and him who shall have to do with her.

And therefore, this is the second commandment: Do not think that love toward woman is good; do not admire the beauty of women, but live with the one to whom you have become united, and do not leave her.

III

33. In the former law it was said: "Do not utter the name of the Lord your God in vain, do not call upon your God when lying, and do not dishonor the name of your God. Do not swear by Me in untruth, so as to profane your God." But I tell you that every oath is a profanation of God.

35. Therefore, swear not at all. Man cannot promise anything, because he is wholly in the power of the Father. A man cannot turn one hair from gray to black; how then shall he swear beforehand, that he will do this and that, and swear by God? Every oath is a profanation of God, for, if a man shall have to fulfil an oath which is against the will of God, it must follow that he has sworn to go against

God's will; so that every oath is evil. But Mt. v. 37
 when men question you about anything, say:
 "Yes," if yes, — "No," if no. Everything
 added to this is evil.

Therefore, the third commandment is:
 Swear nothing, to any one; say "Yes," when
 it is yes, — "No," when it is no; and under-
 stand that every oath is evil.

IV

In the former law it was said: "He who de- 38.
 stroys life, shall give a life for a life; an eye
 for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a hand for a
 hand, an ox for an ox, a slave for a slave,"
 and so on.

But I tell you: Do not wrestle with evil by 39.
 evil. Not only do not take by law an ox for
 an ox, a slave for a slave, a life for a life, but
 do not resist evil at all. If any one wishes to 40.
 take an ox from you by law, give him another;
 if any one wishes to get your coat by law, give
 him your shirt also; if any one strikes out your
 tooth on one side, turn to him the other side.
 If you are made to do one piece of work, do 41.
 two. If men wish to take your property, vi. 30.
 give it to them. If they do not return your
 money, do not ask for it.

And therefore: Do not judge, do not go to 37.
 law, do not punish, and you yourself shall not
 be judged, nor punished. Forgive all, and you
 shall be forgiven, because if you shall judge
 people, they will judge you also.

You cannot judge, because you, all men, are Mt. vii. 1.
 blind, and do not see the truth. How, with 3.
 obstructed eyes, will you discern the mote in
 your brother's eye? You must first clear your
 own eye. But whose eyes are clear? Can a Lk. vi. 39
 blind man lead a blind man? Both will fall

into the pit. Thus, also, they who judge and punish, like the blind, are leading the blind.

Lk. vi. 40. They who judge and condemn people to violent treatment, wounds, maiming, death, wish to teach people. But what else can come from their teaching, than that the pupil will learn his lesson, and will become quite like the teacher? What, then, will he do, when he has learnt his lesson? The same that the teacher does : violence, murder.

Mt. vii. 6. And do not think to find justice in the courts. To seek legal justice, to hand matters over to human courts, is the same as to cast precious pearls before swine ; they will trample upon it, and tear you to pieces.

And, therefore, the fourth commandment is : However men may wrong you, do not resist evil, do not judge and do not go to law, do not complain and do not punish.

V

v. 43. In the former law it was said : "Do good to men of your own nation, and do evil to strangers."

44. But I tell you, love not only your own countrymen, but people of other nations. Let strangers hate you, let them fall upon you, wrong you ; but you speak well of them, and

46. do them good. If you are only attached to your countrymen, why, all men are thus attached to their own countrymen, and hence

45. wars arise. Behave equally well toward men of all nations, and you will be the sons of the Father. All men are His children, and therefore all are brothers to you.

And, therefore, this is the fifth commandment : Behave equally well toward foreigners, as I told you to behave among yourselves.

Before the Father of all men there are neither different nations nor different kingdoms: all are brothers, all sons of one Father. Make no distinction among people as to nations and kingdoms.

And so: I. Do not be angry, but be at peace with all men. II. Do not seek delight in sexual gratification. III. Do not swear anything to any one. IV. Do not oppose evil, do not judge, and do not go to law. V. Do not make any distinction among men as to nationality, and love strangers like your own people.

All these commandments are contained in this one: All that you wish people should do for you, do you even so to them. Mt. vii. 12

Fulfil my teaching, not for men's praise. If you do it for men, then from men you have your reward. But if not for men, then your reward is from the Heavenly Father. So that, vi. 1.
if you do good to men, do not boast about it 2.
before men. Thus hypocrites do, that men
may speak well of them. And they get what
they wish. But if you do good to men, do it 3.
so that no one may see it, so that your left hand
may not know what your right hand is doing.
And your Father will see this, and will give 4.
you what you need.

And, if you wish to pray, do not pray like the hypocrites. Hypocrites love to pray in churches, in the sight of men. They do this for men's sake, and get in return from men that which they wish. 5.

But, if you wish to pray, go where no one may see you, and pray to your Father, the Spirit, and the Father will see what is in your soul, and will give you that which you wish in the spirit. 6.

When you pray, do not chatter with your tongue like the hypocrites. Your Father 7.
8.

knows what you want before you open your lips.

Pray only thus :

Mt. vi. 9. *Our Father, without beginning and without end, like heaven !*

10. *May Thy being only be holy.*

May power be only Thine, so that Thy will be done, without beginning and without end, on earth.

11. *Give me food of life in the present.*

12. *Smooth out my former mistakes, and wipe them away ; even as I so do with all the mistakes of my brothers, that I may not fall into temptation, and may be saved from evil.*

Because Thine is the power and might, and Thine the judgment.

Mk. xi. 25. If you pray, above all, bear no one any malice. For if you do not forgive men their wrong-doing, the Father also will not forgive you yours.

Mt. vi. 16. If you fast, and go hungry, do not show it to men ; thus do the hypocrites, that people may see, and speak well of them. And people speak well of them, and they get what they wish. But do not you do so ; if you suffer want, go about with a cheerful face, that people may not see. But your Father will see, and will give you what you need.

19. Do not lay up store on earth. On earth, the worm consumes, and rust eats, and thieves steal. But lay up heavenly wealth for yourself. Heavenly wealth the worm does not gnaw, nor rust eat, nor thieves steal. Where your wealth is, there will your heart also be.

22. The light of the body is the eye, and the light of the soul is the heart. If your eye is dim, then all your body will be in darkness. And if the light of your heart is dim,

then all your soul will be in darkness. You cannot serve at one time two masters. You will please one, and offend the other. You cannot serve God and the flesh. You will either work for the earthly life or for God. Therefore, do not be anxious for what you shall eat and drink, and wherewith you shall be clothed. Life is more wonderful than food and clothing, and God gave it you. Mt. vi. 24

Look at God's creatures, the birds. They do not sow, reap, or harvest, but God feeds them. In God's sight, man is not worse than the bird. If God gave man life, He will be able to feed him too. But you yourselves know that, however much you strive, you can do nothing for yourselves. You cannot lengthen your life by an hour. And why should you care about clothing? The flowers of the field do not work and do not spin, but are dressed as Solomon in all his glory never was. Well, then, if God has so adorned the grass, which to-day grows and to-morrow is mown, will he not clothe you? 25.

Do not trouble and worry yourselves; do not say that you must think of what you will eat and how you will be clothed. This every one needs, and God knows this need of yours. And so, do not care about the future. Live in the present day. Take care to be in the will of the Father. Wish for that which alone is important, and the rest will all come of itself. Strive only to be in the will of the Father. And so, do not trouble about the future. When the future comes, then it will be time to do so. There is enough evil in the present. 26.

Ask and it shall be given you, seek and you shall find, knock and it shall be opened to you. Is there a father who would give his son a stone instead of bread, or a snake instead of a fish? Then, how is it that we, wicked men, 27.

Lk. xi. 9.

Mt. vii. 9, 10.

11.

are able to give our children that which they need, while your Father in heaven shall not give you that which you truly need, if you ask Him? Ask, and the Heavenly Father will give the life of the spirit to them who ask Him.

Mt. vii. 13. The way to life is narrow, but enter by the narrow way. The way into life is one only. It is narrow and strait. About it the plain lies great and wide, but it is the way of destruction. The narrow way alone leads to life; and few find it. But do not quail, little flock! The Father has promised you the kingdom.

Mt. vii. 15. Only, beware of false prophets and teachers; they approach you in sheepskins, but within they are ravening wolves.

16. By their fruits will you know them; by that which they yield. Figs are not gathered from

17. thistles, nor grapes from thorns. But a good tree brings forth good fruit. And a bad tree

20. brings forth bad fruit. And so you will know

Lk. vi. 45. them by the fruits of their teaching. A good man, from his good heart, brings forth everything that is good; but a wicked man, from his evil heart, brings forth everything evil; for the lips speak from the overflow of the heart. And therefore, if teachers teach you to do to others that which is bad for yourselves,—teach violence, executions, wars,—know that they are false teachers.

Mt. vii. 21. For it is not he that says: Lord, Lord! who shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who fulfils the word of the Heavenly Father.

22. The false teachers will say: "Lord, Lord! we have taught your teaching, and we have driven

23. away evil according to your teaching." But I will disown them, and say to them: No, I never acknowledged you, and do not acknowledge you. Go out of my sight, you are doing that which is unlawful.

And so, every one who has heard these words of mine, and fulfils them, he, like a reasonable man, builds his house upon a rock. And his house will stand against all storms. But he who hears these words of mine, and does not fulfil them, he, like a foolish man, builds his house upon sand. When the storm comes, it will overthrow the house, and all will perish.

Mt. vii. 24.

25.

26.

27.

And all the people wondered at such teaching; because the teaching of Jesus was quite other than that of the orthodox teachers of the law. These taught a law which must be obeyed, but Jesus taught that all men are free. And in Jesus Christ were fulfilled the prophecies of Isaiah: "The people living in darkness, in the shadow of death, saw the light of life, and he who furnished this light of truth does no violence nor harm to men, but he is meek and gentle. He, in order to bring truth into the world, neither disputes nor shouts; his voice is never heard raised. He will not break a straw, and will not blow out the smallest light. And all the hope of men is in his teaching.

Lk. iv. 32.

Mt. iv. 14.

16.

xii. 19.

20.

21.

CHAPTER V

THE TRUE LIFE

The fulfilment of the personal will leads to death; the fulfilment of the Father's will gives true life

("Thy will be done")

AND Jesus rejoiced at the strength of the spirit, and said: —

Mt. xi. 25.

"I acknowledge the spirit of the Father, the source of everything in heaven and earth, Who has revealed that which was hidden from the wise and learned, to the simple, solely through

their acknowledging themselves Sons of the Father.

Mt. xi. 28. "All take care for fleshly happiness, and have put themselves to a load which they cannot draw; they have put a yoke upon themselves which was not made for them.

"Understand my teaching and follow it; and you shall know rest and joy in life. I give you another yoke, and another load; 29. namely, the spiritual life. Put yourselves to that, and you shall learn from me peace and happiness. Be calm and meek in heart, and 30. you will find blessedness in your life. Because my teaching is a yoke made for you, and the fulfilment of my teaching is a light load, with a yoke made for you."

Jn. iv. 31. The disciples of Jesus once asked him 32. whether he wished to eat. He said: "I 33. have food of which you do not know." They thought that some one had brought him some- 34. thing to eat. But he said:—

"My food is to do the will of Him who gave me life, and to fulfil that which He intrusted 35. to me. Do not say 'There is still time,' as the 36. plowman said, waiting for the harvest. He who fulfils the will of the Father is always satisfied, and knows neither hunger nor thirst. The fulfilment of the will of God always satisfies, bearing its reward within itself. You must not say, 'I will afterward fulfil the will of the Father.' While there is life, you always can, and must, fulfil the will of the Father. 37. Our life is the field which God has sown, and 38. our business is to gather its fruits. And if we gather the fruits, we get the reward, life beyond time. True it is, that we do not give ourselves life; some one else does. And if we labor to gather in life, then we, like reapers, get our reward. I teach you to gather in this life, which the Father has given you."

Once, Jesus came to Jerusalem. And there was then a bathing-place there. And men said of this bathing-place, that an angel came down into it, and through this the water in the bath would begin to move, and he who first plunged into the water after it was moved got well from whatever he was ailing. And sheds were made around the bath, and under these sheds sick men lay, waiting for the water in the bath to be moved, in order to plunge into it.

And a man was there who had been infirm thirty-eight years. Jesus asked who he was.

And the man told how he had been ailing so long, and was still waiting to get into the bath first, upon the water being moved, in order to be healed; but for these thirty-eight years he had been unable to get in first, others always getting into the bath before him.

And Jesus saw that he was old, and said to him: "Do you wish to get well?"

He said: "I wish to, but I have no one to carry me into the water in time. Some one always will get in before me."

And Jesus said to him: "Awake, take up your bed and walk."

And the sick man took up his bed and walked.

And it was the Sabbath. And the orthodox said: "You must not take up the bed, for to-day is the Sabbath." He said: "He who raised me, bade me also take up the bed." And the infirm man said to the orthodox, that it was Jesus who had healed him. And they became angry, and accused Jesus, because he did such things on the Sabbath.

And Jesus said: "That which the Father always does, I also do. In truth, I say to you, the Son of himself can do nothing. He does only that which he has understood from the Father. What the Father does, he also does.

Jn. v. 1,
2,
4.

2.

3.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

15.

16.

17.

19.

20.

The Father loves the Son, and by this very fact has taught him everything which the Son should know.

- Jn. v. 21. "The Father gives life to the dead, and thus the Son gives life to him who desires it; because, as the business of the Father is life,
22. so the business of the Son must be life. The Father has not condemned men to death, but has given men power, at will, to die or live.
23. And they will live, if they shall honor the Son as the Father.
24. "I tell you truly, that he who has understood the meaning of my teaching, and has believed in the common Father of all men, already has life, and is delivered from death.
25. They who have understood the meaning of human life, have already escaped from death
26. and shall live forever. Because, as the Father lives of Himself, so also has He given
27. the Son life within himself. And He has given him freedom. It is by this, that he is the Son of Man.
28. "Henceforth all mortals shall be divided
29. into two kinds. They alone, who do good, shall find life; but they who do evil shall be
30. destroyed. And this is not my decision, but it is what I have understood from the Father. And my decision is true, because I thus decide, not in order to do that which I wish, but in order that all may do that which the Father of all wishes.
31. "If I were to assure all that my teaching is true, this would not establish my teaching.
36. But there is that which establishes my teaching; namely, the conduct which I teach. That shows that I do not teach of myself, but in the
37. name of the Father of all men. And my Father, He who has taught me, confirms the truth of my commandments in the souls of all.

“But you do not wish to understand and to know His voice. And you do not accept the meaning this voice speaks. That that which is in you, is spirit descended from heaven, — this, you do not believe. Jn. v. 38

“Enter into the meaning of your writings. You will find in them the same as in my teaching, commandments to live, not for yourself alone, but for the good of men. Why, then, do you not wish to believe in my commandments, which are those that give life to all men? I teach you in the name of the common Father of all men, and you do not accept my teaching; but if any one shall teach you in his own name, him will you believe. 39.

“One cannot believe that which people say to each other, but one can only believe that in every man there is a Son like the Father.” 40.

And that men may not think that the kingdom of heaven is established by anything visible; but that they may understand that the kingdom of God consists in the fulfilment of the Father's will; and understand that the fulfilment of the Father's will depends on each man's effort and striving to make people see that life is given, not for oneself personally, but for the fulfilment of the Father's will, which alone saves from death and gives life, — Jesus told a parable. He said: — Lk. xix. 11.

“There was a rich man, who had to go away from his home. Before he went, he called his slaves, and gave among them ten talents, one to each, and said: ‘While I am away, labor each of you upon what I have given.’ But it happened that, when he was gone, certain inhabitants of that town said: ‘We do not wish to serve him any more.’ When the rich man came back, he called the slaves to whom he had given the money, and bade each say what he had done with his money. The first 12.

16.

- came, and said : ' See, master, for your one I
 Lk. xix. 17. have earned ten.' And the master said to
 him : ' Well done, good servant ; you have
 been trustworthy in a little, I will place you
 over much ; be one with me in all my wealth.'
 18. Another slave came, and said : ' See, master,
 19. for your talent I have earned five.' And the
 master said to him : ' Well done, good slave,
 20. be one with me in all my estate.' And yet
 another came, and said : ' Here is your talent,
 I hid it in a cloth and buried it ; because I was
 21. afraid of you. You are a hard man, you take
 where you did not store, and gather where
 22. you did not sow.' And the master said to
 him : ' Foolish slave ! I will judge you by your
 own words. You say that, from fear of me,
 you hid your talent in the earth, and did not
 work upon it. If you knew that I was severe,
 and take where I did not give, then why did
 you not do that which I bade you do ? If you
 Mt. xxv. 26, 27. had worked upon my talent, the estate would
 Lk. xix. 23. have been added to, and you would have ful-
 filled that which I bade you. But you have
 not done that for which the talent was given
 you, and, therefore, you must not own it.'
 24. And the master bade the talent be taken from
 him who had not worked upon it, and given to
 25. him who had worked most. And then the
 servants said to him : ' Sir, he already has
 26. much.' But the master said : ' Give to them
 who have worked much, because he who looks
 after that which he has, shall receive an in-
 crease. As to them who did not wish to be in
 my power, drive them forth, so that they may
 be here no more.' "

Mt. xxv. 30.

Now this master is the source of life, the spirit, the Father. His slaves are men. The talents are the life of the spirit. As the master does not himself work upon his estate, but bids the slaves to work, each by himself, so

the spirit of life in men has given them the command to work for the life of men, and then left them alone. They who sent to say that they did not acknowledge the authority of the master, are they who do not acknowledge the spirit of life. The return of the master, and the demand for an account, is the destruction of fleshly life, and the decision of the fate of men as to whether they have yet life beyond that which was given them. Some, the slaves who fulfil the will of the master, work upon that which was given them, and make gain on gain; they are those men who, having received life, understand that life is the will of the Father, and is given to serve the life of others. The foolish and wicked slave, who hid his talent and did not work upon it, represents those men who fulfil only their own will, and not the will of the Father; who do not serve the life of others. The slaves who have fulfilled the master's will, and worked for the increase of his estate, become sharers of the whole estate of the master, while the slaves who have not fulfilled the master's will, and have not worked for him, are bereft of that which was given them. People who have fulfilled the will of the Father, and have served life, becomes sharers in the life of the Father, and receive life, notwithstanding the destruction of the fleshly life. They who have not fulfilled the will, and have not served life, are bereft of that life which they had, and are destroyed. They who did not wish to acknowledge the authority of the master, such do not exist for the master; he drives them forth. People who do not acknowledge within themselves the life of the spirit, the life of the Son of man, such do not exist for the Father.

After this, Jesus went into a desert place. And many people followed him. And he

Jn. vi. 1,
2,
3.

- climbed a mountain, and sat there with his followers. And he saw that there was a great throng, and said : " Whence shall we get bread to feed all these people ? " Philip said : " Even two hundred pence will not suffice, if to each be given but a little. We have only a little bread and fish." And another disciple said : " They have bread ; I have seen it. There is a boy who has five loaves and two small fishes."
10. And Jesus said : " Bid them all lie down on the grass."
11. And Jesus took the loaves which he had, and gave them to his disciples, and bade them give them to others ; and so all began to hand from one to another what there was, and all were satisfied, yet much was left over.
26. The next day, the people came again to Jesus. And he said to them : " See, you come to me, not because you have seen wonders, but because you have eaten bread and were satisfied." And he said to them : " Work not for perishable food, but for everlasting food, such as only the spirit of the Son of Man gives, sealed by God."
28. The Jews said : " But what must we do, in order to do the works of God ? "
29. And Jesus said : " The work of God is in this, to believe in that life which He has given you."
30. They said : " Give us a sign that we may believe. What are your deeds which can serve as a proof ? Our fathers ate manna in the wilderness. God gave them bread from heaven to eat ; and so it is written."
32. Jesus answered them : " The true heavenly bread is the spirit of the Son of Man, that which the Father gives. Because the nourishment of man is the spirit descended from heaven. This it is which gives life to the world. My teaching gives true nourishment

to man. He who follows me shall not hunger, and he who believes in my teaching will never know thirst.

"But I have already told you that you have Jn. vi. 36
seen this, yet do not believe.

"All that life which the Father gave the Son 37.
will be realized through my teaching; and every one who believes will be a sharer in it. 38.
I came down from heaven, not to do that which I wish, but to do the will of the Father, of Him who gave me life. But the will of the Father 39.
who sent me is this, that I should keep all that life which He gave, and should not destroy anything of it. And therefore, herein is the will of 40.
the Father who sent me, that every one who sees the Son, and believes in him, should have everlasting life. And my teaching gives life at the last day of the body."

The Jews were shocked at his saying that his teaching was come down from heaven. They 41.
said: "Why, this is Jesus, the son of Joseph; 42.
we know his father and mother. How, then, can he say that his teaching has descended from heaven?"

"Do not debate as to who I am, and whence 43.
I am come," said Jesus. "My teaching is true, 44.
not because I declare, like Moses, that God spoke with me on Sinai; but it is true because it is in you also. Every one who believes my commandments, believes, not because it is I who speak, but because our common Father draws him to Himself; and my teaching will give him life at the last day. And it is written in the prophets, that all shall be taught by God. 45.
Every one who shall understand the Father, and shall learn to understand His will, thereby yields himself to my teaching.

"That any man has seen the Father, this has 46.
never been, except he who is from God; he has seen, and sees, the Father.

Ja. vi. 47. "He who believes in me (in my teaching) has everlasting life.

48. "My teaching is the nourishment of life.

49. Your fathers ate manna, food straight from
50. heaven, and yet they died. But the true nourishment of life, which descends from heaven, is such, that he who is fed with it will not die.

51. My teaching is this nourishment of life descended from heaven. He who is fed with it lives forever. And this nourishment which I teach is my flesh, which I give for the life of all men."

52. The Jews did not understand what he said, and began to dispute as to how it was possible to give one's flesh for the nourishment of men, and why.

53. And Jesus said to them: "If you shall not give up your flesh for the life of the spirit,
54. there will be no life in you. He who does not give up his flesh for the life of the spirit, has
55. not real life. That in me which gives up the flesh for the spirit, that alone lives.

"And therefore, our flesh is the true food
56. for the real life. That only which in me consumes my body, that which gives up the fleshly
57. life for the true life, that only is I. It is in me, and I am in it. And as I live in the flesh by the will of the Father, similarly, that which lives in me lives by my will."

60. And some of his disciples, when they heard this, said: "These are hard words, and it is difficult to understand them."

61. And Jesus said to them: "Your ideas are so confused, that my sayings as to what man was, is, and always will be, seem difficult to
63. you. Man is the spirit in the flesh, and the spirit alone gives life, but the flesh does not give life. In the words which seem so difficult to you, I have really said nothing more than that the spirit is life."

Afterward, Jesus chose seventy men out of his near friends, and sent them into those places where he himself wished to go. He said to them :—

“Many people do not know the blessing of real life. I am sorry for all; and wish to teach all. But as the master is not enough for the reaping of his field, so also I shall not suffice. Go you, then, through the various cities, and everywhere proclaim the fulfilment of the will of the Father.

“Say, The will of the Father is in this: Not to be angered, not to be sensual, not to swear, not to resist evil, and not to make any distinction between people. And accordingly, do ye in everything fulfil these commandments.

“I send you like sheep among wolves. Be wise as snakes, and pure as doves.

“Before everything, have nothing of your own; take nothing with you, neither wallet, nor bread, nor money; only clothes upon your body, and shoes. Further, make no distinction between people; do not choose your hosts, where you shall put up. But in whichever house you shall come first, stay there. When you come into the house, greet the master. If he welcome you, stay; if not, go into another house.

“For that which you shall say, they will hate you, and fall upon, and persecute you. And when they shall drive you out, go into another village; and if they all drive you out of that, go yet into another. They will persecute you as wolves hunt sheep; but do not quail, suffer to the last hour. And they will take you into the courts, and will try you, and will flog you, and will take you before the authorities, that you may justify yourselves before them. And when you shall be taken into the courts, be not afraid; and do not bethink yourselves what you shall say. The spirit of the Father

Lk. x. 1.

2.

3.

Mt. x. 16.

Lk. x. 4.

5.

Mt. x. 12.

22.

23.

19.

will speak through you, what is needful to be said.

Mt. x. 23. "You will not have passed through all the towns, before people will have understood your teachings, and will turn to it.

27. "And so, be not afraid. That which is hidden in the souls of men will come forth.

26. That which you shall say to two or three will

28. spread among thousands. But chiefly, be not afraid of those who may kill your body. To your souls, they can do nothing. And so, do not fear them. But be afraid lest both your bodies and souls be destroyed, by your abstaining from the fulfilment of the will of the

29. Father. That is what you have to fear. Five sparrows are sold for a farthing, but even they

30. shall not die without the Father's will. And a hair shall not fall from the head without the

31. Father's will. So then, what need you be afraid of, seeing you are in the Father's will?

34. "Not all will believe in my teaching. And they who will not believe, will hate it; because it bereaves them of that which they love, and

Lk. xii. 49. strife will come of it. My teaching, like fire,

51. will kindle the world. And from it strife must

52. arise in the world. Strife will arise in every

53. house. Father against son, mother against

daughter; and their kin will become haters of them who understand my teaching, and

xiv. 26. they will be killed. Because, for him who shall understand my teaching, neither his father, nor his mother, nor wife, nor children, nor all his property, will have any weight."

Mk. iii. 22. Then the learned orthodox gathered at Jerusalem, and went to Jesus. Jesus was in

20. a village, and a crowd of people thronged into the place, and stood around.

Mt. xii. 24. The orthodox began to speak to the people, in order that they might not believe in the teaching of Jesus. They said that Jesus was

possessed ; that if they should live by his commandments, there would then be yet more evil among the people than now. They said, that he drove out evil with evil.

Jesus called them to him, and said : " You say that I drive out evil with evil. But no power destroys itself. If it destroys itself, then it would not be. You would drive out evil with threats, executions, murders ; but evil, nevertheless, is not destroyed, precisely because evil cannot make head against itself. But I drive out evil by other means than you do ; that is to say, not with evil. Mt. xii. 25.
26.
27.

" I drive out evil by summoning people to fulfil the will of the Spirit, the Father, who gives life to all. Five commandments express the will of the Spirit which gives happiness and life. And these commandments destroy evil. By their doing so, you have a proof that they are true. 28.
29.

" If men were not sons of one spirit, it would not be possible to overcome evil ; as it is not possible to go into the house of a strong man, and rob it. In order to rob the house of a strong man, it is necessary first to bind the strong man. And men are bound thus in the unity of the spirit of life.

" And therefore I tell you, that every mistake of men, and every wrong interpretation, shall escape punishment ; but false representation about the Holy Spirit, which gives life to all, shall not be forgiven to men. Should any one say a word against man, that is not important ; but should any one say a word against that which is holy in man, against the spirit, this cannot pass unpunished. Gird at me as much as you like, but do not call evil the commandments of life which I have disclosed to you. It cannot pass unpunished, if a man shall call that good which is evil. 31.
32.

- Mt. xii. 30. "It is necessary to be at one with the spirit of life. He who is not at one with it, is against it. It is necessary to serve the spirit of life and of good in all men, and not in oneself alone. You must either hold that life and happiness is good for the whole world, then love life and happiness for all men, or else hold life and happiness an evil, and then not love life and happiness for yourself. You must either hold a tree good, and its fruit good or else hold a tree bad, and its fruit bad. Because a tree is valued by its fruit."

CHAPTER VI

THE FALSE LIFE

Therefore, in order to receive the true life, man must on earth resign the false life of the flesh, and live by the spirit

("On Earth, as in Heaven")

- Lk. viii. 19. AND there came once to Jesus his mother
 Mt. xii. 46. and brothers, who could in no way get to see
 47. him, because there was a great crowd around
 him. And a man saw them, and went up to
 Jesus, and said: "Your family, your mother
 and brothers, are standing without, and wish to
 see you."
 Lk. viii. 21. And Jesus said: "My mother and my
 brothers are they who have understood the
 will of the Father, and fulfil it."
 xi. 27. And a woman said: "Blessed is the womb
 that has brought you forth, and the breasts
 that you have sucked."
 28. Jesus said to this: "Blessed only are they
 who have understood the spirit of the Father,
 and keep it."
 ix. 57. And a man said to Jesus: "I will follow
 you whithersoever you may go."

And Jesus said to him, in answer : " You Lk. ix. 58
cannot follow me ; I have neither house nor
place to live in. Wild beasts have their lairs
and burrows, but man is everywhere at home,
if he lives by the spirit."

And it happened once that Jesus was, with Mk. iv. 35.
his followers, sailing a boat. He said : " Let
us pass over to the other side." A storm arose 37.
upon the lake, and the boat began to fill, so
that it nearly sank. And Jesus lay in the 38.
stern, and slept. They woke him, and said :
" Teacher, is it really all the same to you that
we are perishing ?" And, when the storm had 40.
fallen, he said : " Why are you so timid ? You
do not believe in the life of the spirit."

Jesus said to a man : " Follow me." Lk. ix. 59.

And the man said : " I have an aged father,
let me first bury him, and then I will follow
you."

And Jesus said to him : " Let the dead bury 60.
the dead, but do you, if you wish to truly live,
fulfil the will of the Father, and make that will
known everywhere."

And again, another man said : " I wish to be 61.
your disciple, and will fulfil the will of the
Father, as you command, but let me first settle
my family."

And Jesus said to him : " If the plowman look 62.
behind, he cannot plow. However strong the
reasons you have to look behind, so long as you
look behind, you cannot plow. You must forget
everything except the furrow you are driving ;
then only can you plow. If you consider as
to what will be the outcome for the life of the
body, then you have not understood the real
life, and cannot live by it."

After this, it happened once that Jesus went 38.
with his disciples into a village. And a woman
named Martha invited him into her house.
Martha had a sister named Mary, who sat at 39.

the feet of Jesus, and listened to his teaching.
 Lk. x. 40. But Martha was busy getting ready the meal.

And Martha went up to Jesus, and said: "Do you not see that my sister has left me alone to serve? Tell her to help me in the work."

41. And Jesus said to her in answer: "Martha, Martha! you trouble and busy yourself with many things, but only one thing is needful.

42. And Mary has chosen that one thing which is needful, and which none shall take from her. For true life the food of the spirit alone is needful."

ix. 23. And Jesus said to all: "Whoever wishes to follow me, let him forsake his own will, and let him be ready for all hardships and sufferings of the flesh at every hour; then only can

24. he follow me. Because he who wishes to take heed for his fleshly life will destroy the true life. And he who fulfils the will of the Father, even if he destroy the fleshly life, shall save the true
 25. life. For, what advantage is it to a man if he should gain the whole world, but destroy or harm his own life?"

xlii. 15. And Jesus said: "Beware of wealth, because your life does not depend upon your having more than others.

16. "There was a rich man, who had a great harvest of corn. And he thought to himself:

17, 18. Let me rebuild my barns. I will erect larger ones, and gather there all my wealth. And I

19. will say to my soul: 'There, my soul, you have everything after your desire; rest, eat, drink, and live for your pleasure.' But God
 20. said to him: 'Fool, this very night your soul shall be taken; and all that you have stored up shall go to others.'

21. "And thus it happens with every one who provides for the bodily life, and does not live in God."

xliii. 2. And Jesus said to them: "Now, you say

that Pilate killed the Galileans. But were these Galileans any worse than other people, that this happened to them? In no way. We are all such, and we shall all perish likewise, unless we find salvation from death. Lk. xiii. 3

“Or of those eighteen men, whom the tower crushed in falling, were they particularly worse than all the other dwellers in Jerusalem? In no wise. If we do not find salvation, sooner or later we shall perish in the same way. If we have not yet perished as they, we must think of our position, thus:— 4.

“A man had an apple tree growing in his garden. The master came into the garden, and saw there was no fruit on the tree. And the master said to his gardener: ‘It is now three years since I have watched this apple tree, and it is still barren. It must be cut down, for as it is, it only spoils the place. And the gardener answered: ‘Let us wait yet a little, master; let me dig it round. I will dung it, and let us see what it will be next summer. Maybe it will yield fruit. But if it yields nothing by the summer, well then, we will cut it down.’ 5.
6.

“Likewise we, as long as we live by the flesh, and yield no fruit to the life of the spirit, are barren apple trees. Only by the mercy of some power are we yet left for a summer. And if we do not yield fruit we shall also perish, even like him who built the barn, like the Galileans, like the eighteen men crushed by the tower, and like all who yield no fruit; perishing, dying forever, by death. 7.

“In order to understand this, there is no need of special wisdom; each one sees this for himself. For not only in domestic affairs, but in that also which happens in the whole world, are we able to reason and to foresee. If the wind is in the west, we say there will be rain, 8.
Lk. xii. 54

- Lk.** **xii.** 55. and so it happens. But if the wind is from the south, we say there will be fair weather,
56. and so it is. How, then, is it that we are able to foresee the weather, and yet we cannot foresee that we shall all die and perish, and that the only salvation for us is in the life of the spirit, in the fulfilment of its will?"
- xiv.** 25. And a great multitude went with Jesus, and he once more said to all:—
26. "He who wishes to be my disciple, let him count for nothing father and mother, and wife and children, and brothers and sisters, and all his goods, and let him at every hour be ready
27. for anything. And only he who does as I do, only he follows my teaching, and only he is saved from death.
28. "Because every one, before beginning anything, will reckon whether that which he does is profitable, and if it is profitable, will do it, but if unprofitable, will abandon it. Every one who builds a house will first sit down and reckon how much money is wanted, how much he has, and whether that will suffice to finish
29. it. He will do this, so that it may not happen that he should begin to build, and not finish, for people to laugh at him.
30. "Likewise also, he who wishes to live the fleshly life must first reckon whether he can finish that with which he is busy.
31. "Every king, if he wishes to make war, will first think whether he can go to war with ten
32. thousand against twenty thousand. If he concludes that he cannot, then he will send ambassadors, and make peace, and will not make war. So also, let every man, before giving himself over to the fleshly life, bethink him whether he can wage war against death, or whether death is stronger than he; and whether it is not then better for him to make peace beforehand.

"And so, each of you should first examine what he considers his own family, money, or estate. And, when he has reckoned what all this avails him, and understands that it avails him nothing, then only can he be my disciple." Lk. xiv. 33

And upon hearing this, a man said: "That is very well, if there be indeed a life of the spirit. But what if one abandons all, and there be no such life?" 15.

To this Jesus said: "Not so; every one knows the life of the spirit. You all know it; but you do not do that which you know. Not because you doubt, but because you are drawn away from the true life by false cares, and excuse yourselves from it."

"This is like your conduct, like your deeds: 16
A master got ready a dinner, and sent to invite guests, but the guests began to decline. 18.
One said: 'I have bought land, and I must go and look after it.' Another said: 'I have bought oxen, and I must try them.' A third 19.
said: 'I have taken a wife, and am going to celebrate the wedding.' And the messengers 20.
came and told the master that no one was coming. The master then sent the messengers to invite the beggars. The beggars did 21.
not refuse, but came. And when they were come, there was still room left. And the master sent to call in still more, and said: 'Go and persuade all to come to my dinner, in order that I may have more people.' And they who had refused, from want of leisure, found no place at the dinner. 22.
23

"All know that the fulfilment of the will of the Father gives life, but do not go because the guile of wealth draws them away."

"He who resigns false temporary wealth for the true life in the will of the Father, does as did a certain clever steward. There was a man vi. 1.

who was steward to a rich master. This steward saw that, sooner or later, the master would drive him away, and that he would remain without food, and without shelter. And the steward thought to himself: 'This is what I will do: I will privately distribute the master's goods to the laborers; I will reduce their debts, and then, if the master drives me out, the laborers will remember my kindness, and will not abandon me.' And so the steward did. He called the laborers, his master's debtors, and rewrote their documents. For him who owed a hundred he wrote fifty; for him who owed sixty, he wrote twenty, and similarly for the rest. And the master learned this, and said to himself: 'Well, he has done wisely; otherwise he would have had to beg his bread. To me he has caused a loss, but his own reckoning was wise.'

"For, in the fleshly life, we all understand wherein is the true reckoning, but in the life of the spirit, we do not wish to understand. Thus must we do with unjust, false wealth,—give it up, in order to receive the life of the spirit. And if we regret to give up such trifles as wealth for the life of the spirit, then this life will not be given us. If we do not give up false wealth, then our own true life will not be given us.

"It is impossible to serve two masters at one time; to serve God and Wealth, the will of the Father, and one's own will. Either one or the other."

And the orthodox heard this. But loving wealth, they jeered at him.

And he said to them: "You think that, because men honor you on account of wealth, you are really honorable. It is not so. God does not look at the exterior, but looks at the heart. That which stands high among men, is

abomination in the eyes of God. Now the kingdom of heaven is attainable on earth, and great are they who enter it. But there enter it, not the rich, but those who have nothing. And this has always been so, both according to your law, and according to Moses, and according to the prophets also. Listen. How does it stand with rich and poor in your way of thinking?

“There was a rich man. He dressed well, led an idle and amusing life every day. And there was a vagrant, Lazarus, covered with sores. And Lazarus came to the yard of the rich man, and thought there would be leavings from the rich man’s table, but Lazarus did not get even the leavings, the rich man’s dogs ate up everything, and even licked Lazarus’ sores. And both these died, Lazarus and the rich man. And in Hades, the rich man saw, far off, Abraham; and behold, Lazarus, the beggar, was sitting with him. And the rich man said: ‘Father Abraham, see, Lazarus the beggar is sitting with you. He used to wallow under my fence. I dare not trouble you, but send Lazarus the beggar to me; let him but wet his finger in water, to cool my throat, because I am burning in the fire.’ But Abraham said: ‘But why should I send Lazarus into the fire to you?’ You, in that other world, had what you wished, but Lazarus only saw grief; so that he ought now to be happy. Yes, and though I should like to help you, I cannot, because between us and you there is a great pit, and it is impossible to cross it. We are living, but you are dead.’ Then the rich man said: ‘Well, Father Abraham, send Lazarus the beggar to my home. I have five brothers; I am sorry for them. Let him tell everything to them, and show how harmful wealth is; so that they may not fall into this torture.’ But

Lk. xvi. 16.

17.

19.

20.

21.

22.

23.

24.

25.

26.

27.

28.

29.

Lk. xvi. 30. Abraham said: 'As it is, they know the harm. They were told of it by Moses, and by all the prophets.' But the rich man said: 'Still, it would be better if some one should rise from the dead, and go to them; they would the
31. sooner bethink themselves.' But Abraham said: 'But if they do not listen to Moses and the prophets, then, even if a dead man came to life, they would not listen, even to him.'"

"That one should share all with one's brother, and do good to everybody; this all men know. And the whole law of Moses, and all the prophets, said only this: 'You know this truth, but cannot do it, because you love wealth.'"

Mk. x. 17. And a rich official among the orthodox went up to Jesus, and said to him: "You are a good teacher, what shall I do to receive everlasting life?"

18. Jesus said: "Why do you call me good? Only the Father is good. But, if you wish to have life, fulfil the commandments."

19. The official said: "There are many commandments; which do you mean?"

And Jesus said: "Do not kill, Do not commit adultery, Do not lie, Do not steal. Further, honor your Father, and fulfil His will; and love your neighbor as yourself."

20. But the orthodox official said: "All these commandments I have fulfilled from my childhood; but I ask, what else must one do, according to your teaching?"

21. Jesus looked at him, at his rich dress, and smiled, and said: "One small thing you have left undone. You have not fulfilled that which you say. If you wish to fulfil these commandments: Do not kill, Do not commit adultery, Do not steal, Do not lie, and, above all, the commandment: Love your neighbour as your-

self, — then, at once sell all your goods, and give them to the poor. Then you will have fulfilled the Father's will."

Having heard this, the official frowned, and went away, because he was loath to part with his estates. Mk. x. 22

And Jesus said to his disciples: "As you see, it is in no wise possible to be rich, and to fulfil the Father's will." 23.

The disciples were horrified at these words, so Jesus once more repeated them, and said: "Yes, children, he who has his own property, cannot be in the will of the Father. Sooner may a camel pass through a needle's eye than he who trusts in wealth fulfil the will of the Father." And they were still more horrified, and said: "But, in that case, is it at all possible to keep one's life?" 24.

He said: "To man it seems impossible to support one's life without property; but God, even without property, can support a man's life." 25.

Once, Jesus was going through the town of Jericho. And in this town was the chief of the tax-gatherers, a rich man named Zaccheus. This Zaccheus had heard of the teaching of Jesus, and believed in it. And when he knew that Jesus was in Jericho, he wished to see him. But there were so many people around, that it was impossible to push through to him. Zaccheus was short of stature. So he ran ahead and climbed a tree, in order to see Jesus as he was going past. And thus, in passing by, Jesus saw him, and having learnt that he believed his teaching, said: "Come down from the tree, and go home; I will come to your house." Zaccheus climbed down, ran home, made ready to meet Jesus, and joyfully welcomed him. Lk. xviii. 25.

The people began to criticize, and to say of 26.

Jesus: "See, he has gone into the tax-gatherer's house, — the house of a rogue."

Lk. xix. 8. Meanwhile, Zaccheus said to Jesus: "See, sir, this is what I will do. I will give away half of my goods to the poor, and out of what is left I will repay fourfold those whom I have wronged."

9. And Jesus said: "Now you have saved yourself. You were dead, and are alive; you were lost, and are found; because you have done as Abraham did, when he wished to slay his son;
10. you have shown your faith. Therein is the whole business of man's life; to seek out and save in his soul that which is perishing. But such sacrifice as yours must not be measured by its amount."

Mk. xii. 41. It happened once that Jesus and his disciples were sitting opposite a collecting-box. People were placing their contributions in the box, for God's service. Rich people went up to the box,
42. and put in much. And a poor woman, a widow, came and put in two farthings.

43. And Jesus pointed her out, and said: "See, now, this poor widow has put two farthings in
44. the box. She has put in more than all. Because they put in that which they did not need for their own livelihood; while this woman has put all that she had; she has put in her whole life."

Mt. xxvi. 6. It happened that Jesus was in the house of Simon the leper. And a woman came into the house. And the woman had a vase of precious oil worth fifteen pounds. Jesus said to his disciples, that his death was near. The woman heard this, and pitied Jesus, and, to show him her love, wished to anoint his head with the oil. And she forgot everything, and broke the vase, and anointed his head and feet, and poured out all the oil.

8. And the disciples began to discuss among

themselves, thinking that she had done wrong. And Judas, he who afterward betrayed Jesus, said: "See how much good stuff has gone for nothing. This oil might have been sold for fifteen pounds, with which, how many poor might have been helped!" And the disciples began blaming the woman; who was troubled, and did not know whether she had done well or ill.

Mt. xxvi. 9

Then Jesus said: "You are troubling the woman without cause. She has, indeed, done a good work, and you mistakenly think of the poor. If you wish to do good to the poor, do so; they are always with you. But why call them to mind now? If you pity the poor, go with your pity, do them good. But she has pitied me, and done real good, because she has given away all that she had. Who of you can know what is useful, and what is not necessary? How do you know that there was no need to pour the oil over me? She has thus anointed me with oil, and if it were but to get ready my body for burial, this was needful. She truly fulfilled the will of the Father, in forgetting herself and pitying another. She forgot the reckonings of the flesh and gave away all that she had."

10.

11.

13.

And Jesus said: "My teaching is the fulfilment of the Father's will; and the Father's will can be fulfilled by deeds only; not by mere words. If a man's son, in answer to his father's bidding, keeps saying, 'I obey, I obey,' but does nothing which his father bids, he then does not fulfil the will of his father. But if another son keeps saying, 'I do not wish to obey,' and then goes and does his father's bidding, he indeed fulfils the father's will. And so with men: Not he is in the Father's will who says: 'I am in the Father's will,'—but he who does that which the Father wishes."

xxi. 28.

29.

CHAPTER VII

I AND THE FATHER ARE ONE

*The true food of everlasting life is the fulfilment of the
Father's will*

("Give us our daily bread")

Jn. vii. 1. AFTER this the Jews tried to condemn Jesus to death, and Jesus went away into Galilee, and lived with his relations.

The Jewish feast of tabernacles was come.
2, And the brothers of Jesus got ready to go to
3, the feast, and invited him to go with them.
5, They did not believe in his teaching, and said
3, to him : —

"Now, you say that the Jewish service of God is wrong, that you know the real service of God by deeds. If you really think that no one but yourself knows the true service of God, then come with us to the feast. Many people will be there, and you can declare before them all that the teaching of Moses is wrong. If all believe you, then it will be clear to your disciples also, that you are right. Why
4, make a secret of it? You say that our service is wrong, that you know the true service of God ; well then, show it to all."

6. And Jesus said : "For you, there is a special time and place in which to serve God ; but for me, there is none. I always and everywhere
7, work for God. This is just what I show to people. I show to them that their service of God is wrong, and therefore do they hate me.
8, Go you to the feast, and I will go when I think fit."

9, And the brothers went, but he remained
10, behind, and only came up at the middle of
11, the feast. And the Jews were shocked at

his not honoring their feast, and delaying to come. And they discussed his teaching much. Some said that he spoke the truth, while others said that he only disturbed the people.

Jn. vii. 12.

At the middle of the feast, Jesus entered the temple, and began to teach the people that their service of God was wrong; that God should be served not in the temple and by sacrifices, but in the spirit, and by deeds. All listened to him and wondered that he knew the whole of wisdom without having learnt. And Jesus, having heard that all wondered at his wisdom, said to them:—

24.

15.

16.

“My teaching is not my own, but His who sent me. If any one wishes to fulfill the will of the Spirit which sent us into life, he will know that I have not invented this teaching, but that it is of God. Because he who invents from himself, follows his own mere imaginations; but he who seeks the mind of Him who sent him, he is right, and there is no wrong in him.

17.

18.

“Your law of Moses is not the Father’s law, and, therefore, they who follow it do not fulfil the Father’s law, but work evil and falsehood. I teach you the fulfilment of the will of the Father alone, and in my teaching there cannot be contradiction. But your written law of Moses is all full of contradictions. Do not judge by outside appearance, but judge by the spirit.”

19.

21.

22.

23.

24.

And some said: “While he has been called a false prophet, see, he condemns the law, and no one makes a charge against him. Maybe in very deed he is a true prophet; maybe even the authorities have acknowledged him. Only one reason makes it impossible to believe him, namely, that it is said, when he who is sent from God shall come, no one will know

25.

26.

27.

whence he is come; but we know this man's birth and all his family."

The people still did not understand his teaching, and still sought proofs.

Jn. vii. 28. Then Jesus said to them: "You know me, and whence I am, after the flesh. But you do not know whence I am, after the spirit. You do not know Him, from whom I am according to the spirit; and that is the only needful
19. knowledge. If I had said that I am Christ, you would have believed me, the Man, but you would not have believed the Father who is in me, and in you. But it is necessary to believe the Father only.

33. "I am here among you for the short space of my life. I point out to you the way to that source of life, from which I have come forth.

34. And you ask of me proofs, and wish to condemn me. If you do not know the way, then, when I shall be no more, you will in nowise find it. You must not discuss me, but must follow me. Whoever shall do that which I say, he shall know whether what I say is true. He for whom the fleshly life has not become the food of the spirit, he who follows not the truth, thirsting for it as for water, cannot
37. understand me. But he who thirsts for the
38. truth, let him come to me to drink. And he who shall believe in my teaching shall receive the
39. true life. He shall receive the life of the spirit."

40. And many believed in his teaching, and said: "That which he says is the truth and is of God."
42. Others did not understand him, and still sought in prophecies for proofs that he was sent from
43. God. And many disputed with him, but none
44. could controvert him. The learned orthodox
45. sent their assistants to contend with him, but their assistants returned to the orthodox priests and said: "We can do nothing with him."

And the high priests said to them: "But why

have you not convicted him?" And they answered: "Never did any man speak as he."

Jn. vii. 46.

Then the orthodox said: "It signifies nothing that it is impossible to controvert him, and that the people believe in his teaching. We do not believe, and none of the authorities believe. But the people is cursed, they were always stupid and unlearned; they believe every one."

47.

48.

49.

And Nicodemus, the man to whom Jesus explained his teaching, said to the high priests: "It is impossible to condemn a man without having heard him to the end, without understanding whither he is leading." But they said to him: "It is useless to discuss, or pay any attention to this affair. We know that a prophet cannot come from Galilee."

50.

51.

52.

At another time, Jesus was speaking with the orthodox, and said to them: "There can be no proofs of the truth of my teaching, as there cannot be of the illumination of light. My teaching is the real light, by which people tell what is good and what is bad, and therefore it is impossible to prove my teaching; which itself proves everything. Whoever shall follow me shall not be in darkness, but shall have life. Life and enlightenment, which are one and the same."

viii. 12.

But the orthodox said: "You alone say this."

13.

And he answered them and said: "And if I alone say this, yet I am right; because I know whence I came, and whither I go. According to my teaching, there is reason in life; whereas, according to yours, there is none. Besides this, not I alone teach, but my Father, the Spirit, teaches the same."

14.

18.

They said: "Where is your Father?"

19.

He said: "You do not understand my teaching, and therefore you do not know my Father. You do not know whence you are and whither you go. I lead you, but you, instead of follow-

21.

ing me, discuss who I am. Therefore you cannot come to that salvation of life to which I lead you. And you will perish, if you remain in this error, and do not follow me.”

And the Jews asked : “ Who are you ? ”

26. He said : “ From the very beginning, I tell you, I am the Son of Man, acknowledging the
27. Spirit as my Father. That which I have understood of the Father, the same I tell to the
28. world. And when you shall exalt in yourselves the Son of Man, then you shall know what I am ; because I do and speak, not of myself, as a man, but I do and speak that which the Father has taught me. This I say, this I teach.

29. “ And he who sent me is always with me ; and the Father has not left me, because I do
31. His will. Whoever will keep to my understanding of life, whoever will fulfil the will of the Father, he will be truly taught by me. In order to know the truth, it is necessary to do good to men. He who does evil to men, loves darkness, and goes into it ; he who does good to men, goes to the light ; so that, in order to understand my teaching, it is necessary to do
32. good deeds. He who shall do good, shall know the truth ; he shall be free from evil and death.
34. Because every one who errs becomes the slave of his error.

35. “ And as the slave does not always live in the house of the master, while the son of the master is always in the house, so also a man, if he errs in his life and becomes a slave through his errors, does not live always, but dies. Only he who is in the truth remains always living. The truth is in this, to be not a slave, but a son. So that, if you err, you will
36. be slaves and die. But if you are in the truth, then you shall be free sons, and shall be living.

37. “ You say of yourselves that you are sons of

Abraham, that you know the truth. But see, you wish to kill me, because you do not understand my teaching. It comes to this, that I speak that which I have understood from my Father, and you wish to do that which you have understood from your father."

Jn. viii. 38.

They said: "Our father is Abraham."

39

Jesus said to them: "If you were the sons of Abraham you would do his deeds. But see, you wish to kill me because I told you that which I had learnt from God. Abraham did not do in that way; therefore you do not serve God, but serve your father, another one."

40

They said to him: "We are not bastards, but we are all children of our Father, all sons of God."

41.

And Jesus said to them: "If your father were one with me, you would love me, because I came forth from that Father. For I was not born of myself. You are not children of the one Father with me, therefore you do not understand my word; my understanding of life does not find place in you. If I am of the Father, and you of the same Father, then you cannot wish to kill me. But if you wish to kill me, then we are not of one Father."

42.

43.

"I am from the Father of good, from God; but you are from the devil, from the father of evil. You wish to do the lusts of your father the devil, who is always a murderer, and a liar, with no truth in him. If he, the devil, says anything, he says what is of himself, and not common to all, and he is the father of lying. Therefore you are the servants of the devil and his children. Now you see how plainly you are convicted of error. If I err, then convict me; but if there is no error in me, then why do you not believe in me?"

44.

46.

And the Jews began to revile him, and to say he was possessed.

48.

Jn. viii 49. He said : " I am not possessed ; but I honor the Father, and you wish to kill me ; therefore you are not brothers of mine, but children of another father. It is not I that affirm that I
50. am right, but the truth speaks for me. Therefore I repeat to you : he who shall comprehend my teaching and perform it, shall not see death."

52. And the Jews said : " Well, do not we speak the truth in saying that you are a Samaritan possessed, and that you convict yourself ? The prophets died, Abraham died ; but you say that he who performs your teaching shall not see
53. death. Abraham died, and shall you not die ? Or are you greater than Abraham ? "

54. The Jews were still discussing as to whether he, Jesus of Galilee, was an important prophet, or unimportant, and forgot that he had told them that he said nothing of himself as a man, but spoke of the spirit that was within him.

And Jesus said : " I do not make myself to be anything. If I spoke of myself, of that which only seems to me, then all that I should say would mean nothing. But there is that source of everything which you call God ; well,
55. it is of Him that I speak. But you have not known, and do not know the true God. But I know Him, and I cannot say that I do not know Him ; I should be a liar like you, if I said that I do not know Him. I know Him,
56. and know His will, and fulfil it. Abraham, your father, saw and rejoiced over my understanding."

57. The Jews said : " You are only thirty years old, how were you living at the same time as Abraham ? "

58. He said : " Before Abraham was, there was the understanding of good, there was that which I tell you."

59. Then the Jews picked up stones in order to kill him, but he went away from them.

Jesus said: "My teaching is the awakening of life. He who believes in my teaching, notwithstanding that he dies in the flesh, remains living, and every one who lives and believes in me shall not die."

Jn. xi. 25.

And yet a third time Jesus taught the people; he said: "Men surrender themselves to my teaching, not because I myself prove it. It is impossible to prove the truth. The truth itself proves all the rest. But men surrender to my teaching, because there is no other than it; it is known to men, and promises life."

26.

x. 1.

"My teaching is to men as the shepherd's familiar voice is to the sheep, when he comes among them through the door, and gathers them, to lead them to the pasture. But your teaching, no one believes; because it is foreign to them, and because they see in it your own lusts. It is with men as with sheep, at the sight of a man who does not enter by the door, but climbs over the fence. The sheep do not know him, but feel that he is a robber. My teaching is the only true teaching; like the one door for the sheep. All your teachings of the law of Moses are lies, they are all like thieves and robbers to the sheep. He who shall give himself up to my teaching shall find true life; just as the sheep go forth and find food, if they follow the shepherd."

2,
3.

5.

7.

8.

9.

"A thief only comes to steal, rob, and destroy, but the shepherd comes to give life. And my teaching alone promises, and gives the true life."

10.

"There are shepherds to whom the sheep are the chief interest in life, and who give up their lives for the sheep. These are true shepherds. And there are hirelings who do not care about the sheep, because they are hirelings, and the sheep are not theirs; so that if a wolf comes they abandon their charge and

11.

12

flee from them, and the wolf devours the sheep.
Jn. x. 13. These are false shepherds. And so there are false teachers, such as have no concern with the life of people; while true teachers give up their lives for the life of men.

14, 17. "I am such a teacher. My teaching is this, —to give up one's life for the life of men.

18. No one shall take my life from me, but I myself freely give it up for men, in order to receive true life. The commandment to do this I re-

15. ceived from my Father. And as my Father knows me, so I also know Him; and therefore

17. I lay down my life for men. Therefore the Father loves me, because I fulfil His commandments.

16. "And all men, not only those here now, but all men, shall understand my voice; and all shall come together into one, and all men shall be one, and their teaching one."

24. And the Jews surrounded him, and said: "All that you say is difficult to understand, and does not agree with our writings. Do not torment us, but simply and straightforwardly tell us, whether you are that Messiah who, according to our writings, should come into the world."

25. And Jesus answered them: "I have already told you who I am, but you do not believe. If you do not believe my word, then believe my works; by them understand who I am, and wherefore I am come.

26. "But you do not believe me because you do
27. not follow me. He who follows me, and does
28. that which I say, he understands me. And he who understands my teaching and fulfils it, re-
29. ceives the true life. My Father has united
30. them with me, and no one can disunite us. I and the Father are one."

31. And the Jews were offended at this, and took up stones to kill him.

But he said to them: "I have shown you many good works, and have disclosed the teaching of my Father. For which, then, of these good works do you wish to stone me?"

Jn. x. 32.

They said: "Not for the good do we wish to stone you; but because you, a man, make yourself God."

33.

And Jesus answered them: "Why, this is just what is written in your writings, where it says that God Himself said to the wicked rulers: 'You are gods.' If He called even vicious men gods, then why do you consider it sacrilege to call that the son of God, which God in His love sent into the world? Every man in the spirit is the son of God. If I do not live in God's way, then do not believe that I am a son of God. But if I live after God's way, then believe from my life that I am in the Father, and then you will understand that the Father is in me and I in Him."

34.

35.

36.

37.

38.

And the Jews began to dispute. Some said that he was possessed, and others said: "A man who is possessed cannot enlighten men." And they did not know what to do with him, and could not condemn him. And he went again across the Jordan, and remained there. And many believed in his teaching, and said that it was true, as the teaching of John was. Therefore many believed in it.

20.

21.

39.

40.

41.

42.

And Jesus once said to his disciples: "Tell me how the people understand my teaching about the son of God and the son of man."

Mt. xvi. 13.

They said: "Some understand it like the teaching of John, others like the prophecies of Isaiah; others, again, say that it is like the teaching of Jeremiah. They understand that you are a prophet."

14.

"And how do you understand my teaching?"

15.

And Simon Peter said to him: "In my opinion, your teaching consists in this, that

16.

you are the chosen Son of the God of Life. You teach that God is the life in man."

- Mt. xvi. 17. And Jesus said to him: "Happy are you, Simon, that you have understood this. No man could disclose this to you; but you have understood this, because God in you has disclosed it to you. Not fleshly understanding, and not I, my words, have disclosed this to you; but God my Father has directly disclosed it. And upon this is founded that society of men for whom there is no death."

CHAPTER VIII

LIFE IS NOT TEMPORAL

Therefore true life is to be lived in the present

("This day")

- Mt. x. 38. JESUS said: "He who is not ready for all fleshly sufferings and bereavements, has not understood me. He who shall obtain all that is best for the fleshly life, shall destroy the true life; he who shall destroy his fleshly life in fulfilling my teaching, shall receive the true life."
- xix. 27. And in answer to these words, Peter said to him: "See, we have listened to you, have thrown off all cares and property, and have followed you. What reward shall we have for this?"
- Mk. x. 29, 30. And Jesus said to him: "Every one who has abandoned home, sisters, brothers, father, mother, wife, children, and his fields, for my teaching, shall receive a hundredfold more than sisters and brothers and fields, and all that is needful in this life; and besides this, he receives life beyond the power of time. There are no rewards in the kingdom of heaven, the kingdom of heaven is its own aim and reward."
- 31.

In the kingdom of God all are equal, there is neither first nor last.

“Because the kingdom of heaven is like this. Mt. xx. 1.
 The master of a house went in the early morning to hire laborers for his grounds. 2.
 He hired laborers at a penny a day, and set them to work in the garden. And he again went at 3.
 mid-day and hired more, and sent them into the garden to work; and at evening he hired 8.
 still more, and sent them to work. And with them all he agreed at a penny. The time 9.
 came for the reckoning. And the master ordered all to be paid alike. First, those who 10.
 came last; and afterward, the first. And the first saw that the last received each a penny. 11.
 And they thought that they would receive more; but the first were also given each a 12.
 penny. They took it and said: ‘But how is this? They only worked one shift, and we all 13.
 four; why, then, do we receive alike? This is unjust.’ But the master came up, and said: 14.
 ‘What are you complaining about? Have I offended you? The amount I hired you for, I have given you. Our agreement was for a 15.
 penny, take it and go. If I wish to give to the last the same as to you, am I not master 16.
 of my own will? Or because you see that I am good, is that the cause of your grudging?’”

In the kingdom of God there is neither first nor last, for all there are as one. 20.

There came to Jesus two of his disciples, James and John, and said: “Promise us that Mk. x. 35.
 you will do that for us which we shall ask of you.”

He said: “What do you wish?” Mt. xx. 21.

They said: “That we may be equal with you.” 22.

Jesus said to them: “You yourselves do not know what you ask. You may live just as I do, and be cleansed from fleshly life like me,

Mt. xx. 23. but to make you like myself is not in my power. Every man may, by his own effort, enter the kingdom of his Father, having submitted to His power, and fulfilling His will."

24. When they heard of this, the other disciples grew angry with the two brothers, because these wished to be equal to their teacher, and the first among his disciples.

25. But Jesus called them, and said: "If you brothers, James and John, asked me to make you such as I am in order to be first among my disciples, then you were mistaken; but if you, my other disciples, are angry with them because they wish to be your elders, then you also are mistaken. Only in the world are kings and officials reckoned by seniority for governing the people. But among you, there
26. cannot be either elder or younger. Among you, for one to be greater than another, it is
27. necessary to be the servant of all. Among you, let him who wishes to be first, consider
28. himself last. Because therein is the will of the Father as to the Son of Man; who does not live to be served, but to himself serve all, and to give up his fleshly life, as a ransom for the life of the spirit."

xviii. 11. And Jesus said to the people: "The Father
12. seeks to save that which perishes. He rejoices over it, as a shepherd rejoices when he has found one sheep that was lost. When one is lost, he leaves the ninety-nine, and goes
Lk. xv. 8. to save the lost one. And if a woman lose a farthing, she will sweep out the whole hut and
10. seek until she find it. The Father loves the Son, and calls him to Himself."

xiv. 8. And he told them yet another parable, to the effect that they who live in the will of God ought not to exalt themselves. He said: "If you are invited to dinner, do not seat yourself in the front corner; some one will

come of more consideration than yourself, and the master will say: 'Leave your place, and allow him who is better than you to be seated.' Then you will be put to shame. But do better, take your seat in the very last place, then the master will find you, and call you to a place of honor, and you will be honored.

Lk. xiv. 9.

10.

"So also in the kingdom of God there is no room for pride. He who exalts himself, by so doing lowers himself; but he who humbles himself, and considers himself unworthy, by this same means raises himself in the kingdom of God.

11.

"A man had two sons. And the younger said to his father: 'Father, give me my property.' And the father gave him his share. The younger son took his share, went abroad, squandered all his property, and began to suffer want. And abroad, he became a swineherd. And he so hungered, that he ate acorns with the swine. And he bethought himself of his life, and said: 'Why did I take my share and leave my father? My father had plenty of everything; at my father's, even laborers ate their fill. But I here am eating the same food as the swine. I will go to my father, fall at his feet, and say: I am to blame, father, before you, and am not worthy to be your son. Take me back even as a laborer.' So he thought, and he went to his father. And when he was still far off, his father at once recognized him, and himself ran to meet him, embraced him, and began to kiss him. And the son said: 'Father, I am to blame before you, I am not worthy to be your son.' But the father would not even listen, and said to the laborers: 'Bring quickly the best clothes and the best boots, to clothe him and shoe him. And go and bring a fatted calf and kill it, and we will rejoice that this my son was

xv. 11.

12.

13.

15.

16.

17.

18.

20.

21.

22.

23.

24.

- dead and is now alive, was lost and is now found.' And the elder brother came from the field, and as he approached he heard the sounds of music in the house. He called a servant to him, and said: 'Why is there this merry-making here?' And the boy said: 'Have you not heard that your brother is returned, and your father is full of joy, and has ordered a fatted calf to be killed, for joy that his son has returned?' The elder brother was offended, and did not go into the house. And the father came out and called him. And he said to his father: 'See, father, how many years I have worked for you, and have not disobeyed your command, while you never killed a fatted calf for me. But my younger brother left the house and squandered all his property with drunkards, and you have now killed the calf for him.' And the father said: 'You are always with me, and all mine is yours; and you should not be offended, but should be glad that your brother was dead and has become alive, was lost and is found.'

- Mk. xii. 1.** "A master planted a garden, cultivated it, arranged it, did everything so that the garden might yield as much fruit as possible. And he sent laborers into the garden, that they might work there, and gather the fruit, and pay him according to the agreement for the garden. (The master is the Father; the garden, the world; the laborers, men. The Father does no more than send His Son, the Son of Man, into the world, that men may yield fruit to the Father from the understanding of life which He placed in them.) The time came when the master sent a servant for the rents. (The Father, without ceasing, tells men that they must fulfil His will.) The laborers drove away the messenger of the master with nothing, and continued to live, imagining that the gar-

den was their own, and that they themselves, of their own will, were settled on it. (Men drive away from themselves the declaration of the will of the Father, and continue to live, each one for himself, imagining that they live for the joys of the fleshly life.) Then the master sent one after another his chosen ones, then his son, to remind the laborers of their debt. But the laborers quite lost their reason, and imagined that if they killed this son of the master, who reminded them that the garden was not theirs, they would be left quite in peace. So they killed him.

Mk. xii. 4.
6.

7.

8.

"Thus men do not love even a reminder of the spirit which lives in them, and declares to them that it is eternal and they are not eternal; and they have killed, as far as they could, the consciousness of the spirit; they have wrapped in a cloth and buried in the ground the talent that was given them.

"What, then, is the master to do? Nothing else than drive forth those laborers, and send others.

Mt. xxi. 40,
41.

"What is the Father to do? Sow until there shall be fruit. And this He does.

"People have not understood and do not understand that the consciousness of the spirit which is in them, and which they hide because it troubles them, brings life to them through understanding it. They reject that stone upon which everything rests. And they who do not take as foundation the life of the spirit, do not enter into the kingdom of heaven, and do not receive life. In order to have faith, and to receive life, it is necessary to understand one's position, and not to expect rewards."

42.

43.

Then the disciples said to Jesus: "Increase in us our faith. Tell us that which will make us more strongly believe in the life of the spirit, that we may not regret the life of the flesh,

Lk. xvii. 5.

which must be given up wholly for the life of the spirit. For reward, you yourself say there is none."

And in answer to this, Jesus said to them :
 "If you had such a faith as the faith that from a birch seed there springs up a great tree ; if, also, you believed that in you there is the germ, the only germ, of the spirit whence springs up the true life, you would not ask me to increase in you your faith.

"Faith does not consist in believing something wonderful, but faith consists in understanding one's position, and wherein lies salvation. If you understand your position, you will not expect rewards, but will believe in that which is intrusted to you.

7. "When the master returns with the laborers from the field, he does not seat the laborer at
 8. his table. But he bids him see to the cattle, and prepare his supper, and after this only
 9. says to the laborer : 'Sit down, drink and eat.' The master will not thank the laborer for having done what he ought to do. And the laborer, if he understands that he is a laborer, is not offended, but works, believing that he will receive his due.

10. "And so you, also, must fulfil the will of the Father, and think that we are worthless laborers, having only done what we ought to do, and not expect a reward, but be content with receiving that which is due to you.

"There is no need to take care to believe that there will be a reward, and life ; this cannot be otherwise ; but there is need to take care not to destroy this life, not to forget that it is given us that we may bring forth its fruits, and fulfil the will of the Father.

xii. 35, 36. "And therefore always be ready, like servants awaiting a master, to answer him immediately when he comes. The servants do
 37, 38.

not know when he will return, either early or late, and they must always be ready. And when they meet the master, they have fulfilled his will, and it is well for them.

“So in life also. Always, every minute of the present, you must live the life of the spirit, not thinking of the past or the future, and not saying to yourself : then or there I will do this or that.

“If the master knew when the thief would come, he would not sleep ; and so do you also never sleep ; because, to the life of the son of man time is nothing ; he lives only in the present, and does not know when is the beginning or end of life. Lk. xii. 39.

“Our life is the same as that of a slave whom the master has left as chief in his household. And well it is for that slave if he does the will of the master always ! But if he shall say, Mt. xxiv. 45, 46.
‘The master will not soon return,’ and shall forget the master’s business, then the master will return unexpectedly, and will drive him out. 48.
50,
51.

“And so, be not downcast, but always live in the present by the spirit. For the life of the spirit there is no time. Mk. xiii. 33.

“Look to yourselves, so as not to weigh yourselves down, and not to blind yourselves with drunkenness, gluttony, and cares ; so as not to let the time of salvation pass. The time of salvation, like a web, is cast over all ; it is there always. And therefore always live the life of the Son of Man. Lk. xxi. 34.

“The kingdom of heaven is like this. Ten maidens went with lamps to meet the bridegroom. Five were wise and five foolish. The foolish ones took lamps but did not take oil ; but the wise took lamps and a store of oil. While they waited for the bridegroom, they went to sleep. When the bridegroom was approaching, the foolish maidens saw that they had little oil, and went to buy some ; and while they were gone, Mt. xxv. 1.
2,
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
10.

the bridegroom came. And the wise maidens who had oil went in with him, and the doors were shut. Their business was only this, to meet the bridegroom with lights; and the five foolish ones forgot that it was important, not only that the lights should burn, but that they should burn in time. And in order that they might be burning when the bridegroom came, they must burn without stopping.

“Life is only for this, to exalt the Son of Man, and the Son of Man exists always. He is not in time; and therefore, in serving him, one must live without time, in the present alone.

Lk. xiii. 24. “Therefore make efforts in the present to
25. enter into the life of the spirit. If you do not

Mt. xvi. 27. make these efforts you shall not enter. You
will say: ‘We said so and so.’ But there will
be no good works to show, and there will not
be life. Because the Son of Man, the one true
spirit of life, will appear in each man, as such
man has acted for the Son of Man.

Mt. xxv. 32. “Mankind is divided according to the way
in which men serve the Son of Man. And
by their works men shall be divided into two
classes, as sheep are divided from goats in
the flock. The one shall live, the other per-
ish.

34. “They who have served the Son of Man,
they shall receive that which belonged to them
from the beginning of the world, that life
which they have kept. They have kept life
by the fact that they have served the Son of
Man. They have fed the hungry, clothed the
naked, welcomed the stranger, visited the pris-
oner. They have lived in the Son of Man,
felt that he only is in all men, and therefore
they have loved their neighbors.

“Whereas they who have not lived in the
Son of Man, they have not served him, have

not understood that he alone is in all, and therefore have not joined in him and have lost life in him, and have perished."

CHAPTER IX

TEMPTATIONS

The illusions of temporal life conceal from men the true life in the present

("Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors")

ONCE, children were brought to Jesus. His disciples began to drive the children away. Jesus saw this being done, and was grieved, and said:—

"You drive the children away without reason. They are better than any, because children all live after the Father's will. They are, indeed, already in the kingdom of heaven. You should not drive them away, but learn from them; because, in order to live in the Father's will, you must live as children live. Children do not abuse one another, do not bear ill-will to people, do not commit adultery, do not swear by anything, do not resist evil, do not go to law with any one, acknowledge no difference between their own people and foreigners. Therefore are they better than grown people, and are in the kingdom of heaven. If you do not refrain from all the temptations of the flesh, and become as children, you will not be in the kingdom of heaven.

"Only he who understands that children are better than we, because they do not break the Father's will, only he understands my teaching. And he who understands my teaching, he alone understands the Father's will. We cannot despise children, because they are bet-

Mt. xix. 13.

14.

Lk. xviii. 17.

Mt. xviii. 3.

5.

Lk. ix. 48.

Mt. xviii. 10.

ter than we, and their hearts are pure in the sight of the Father, and are always with Him.

Mt. xviii. 14. "And not one child perishes by the Father's will. They perish only as men entice them from the truth. And therefore it behooves us to take care of them, and not to entice them from the Father, and from true life.

"That man does ill who entices them from purity. To entice a child from good, to lead it into temptation, is as bad as to hang a mill-stone on its neck and throw it into the water. It is hard for it to swim to the surface; it is more likely to drown. It is as hard for a child to get out of temptation into which a grown-up man leads it.

7. "The world of men is unhappy only on account of temptations. Temptations are everywhere in the world, they always were and always will be; and man perishes from temptations.

8. "Therefore give up everything, sacrifice everything, if only you may not fall into temptation. A fox, if it fall into a trap, will wrench off its paw and go away, and the paw will heal and it will remain alive. Do you likewise. Give up everything, if only not to sink into temptation.

Lk. xvii. 3. "Beware of temptation under that first commandment; do not bear ill-will against men, when people offend you, and you would wish to be avenged on them.

Mt. xviii. 15. "If a man offend you, remember that he is the son of the same Father, and your brother. If he has offended you, go and persuade him of it face to face. If he listen to you, then you have the advantage, you will have found a new

16. brother. If he do not listen to you, then call to your aid two or three others who may persuade him. And if he repent, forgive him. And if he offend you seven times, and seven

Lk. xvii. 4.

times says, 'Forgive me,' then forgive him. But if he does not listen, then tell the society of believers in my teaching, and if he listens not to them, then forgive him, and have nothing to do with him.

Mt. xviii. 17

"Because the kingdom of God is like this. A king began to settle with his tenants. And there was a man brought to him who owed him a million, and had nothing to pay him with. Then the king commanded to sell the man's estate, his wife, his children, and the man himself. But the tenant began to beg mercy of the king. And the king was gracious to him, and pardoned all his debt. And now, this same tenant went home, and saw a peasant. This peasant owed him fifty shillings. The king's tenant seized him, began to strangle him, and said: 'Give me what you owe me.' And the peasant fell at his feet, and said: 'Have patience with me, I will pay you all.' But the tenant showed him no mercy, and put the peasant into prison, to stay there until he paid everything. Other peasants saw this, and went to the king, and told what the tenant had done. Then the king called the tenant, and said to him: 'Wicked creature, I pardoned you all your debt, because you prayed me. And you, also, should have shown mercy to your debtor, because I showed mercy to you.' And the king became angry, and gave the tenant to be made to suffer, until he should pay all his rent.

23.

24.

25.

26.

27.

28.

29.

30.

31.

32.

33.

34.

35.

"Just so, the Father will do with you, if you do not forgive, from the bottom of your heart, all those who are to blame in your sight.

"You know that if a quarrel arise with a man, it is better to make it up with him without going to the court. You know this, and you act so because you know, should it go to the court, you will lose more. Now, it is the

v. 25.

same with all malice. If you know that malice is a bad thing, and removes you from the Father, then get clear of malice as soon as possible, and make your peace.

- Mt. xviii. 18. "You yourselves know that as you become bound on earth, so you will be before the Father. And as you free yourselves on earth, so you will be also free before the Father.
19. Understand that if two or three on earth are united in my teaching, everything they may desire they already have from my Father.
20. Because where two or three are joined in the name of the spirit in man, the spirit of man is living in them.

Mk. x. 2. "Beware also of temptation under the second commandment; the temptation for men to change their wives."

Mt. xix. 3. There once came to Jesus orthodox teachers, who, trying him, said: "May a man leave his wife?"

4. He said to them: "From the very beginning man was created male and female. This was
5. the will of the Father. And therefore a man leaves father and mother and cleaves to his wife. And husband and wife unite in one
6. body. So that the wife is the same for a man as his own flesh. Therefore man must not break the natural law of God, and separate
8. that which is united. According to your law of Moses, it is said that you may abandon a wife and take another; but this is untrue. According to the Father's will, this is not so,
9. and I tell you that he who casts off his wife drives into immorality both her, and him who shall have to do with her. And casting off his wife, a man breeds immorality in the world."
10. And the disciples said to Jesus: "It is too hard to be tied for life, whatever happens, to one wife. If that must be, it were better not to marry."

He said to them: "You may refrain from marriage, but you must understand what you are about. If any one wishes to live without wife, let him be quite pure, and not approach women; but he who loves women, let him unite with one wife and not cast her off, and not gaze upon others. Mt. xix. 11.

"Beware of temptation against the third commandment; the temptation to force people to fulfil obligations and to take oaths." 12.

Once, tax-gatherers came to Peter, and asked him: "How about your teacher, does he pay taxes?" Peter said: "No, he does not." xvii. 24.

And he went and told Jesus that he had been stopped, and told that all were bound to pay taxes. 25.

Then Jesus said to him: "The king does not take taxes of his sons; and moreover, men are not bound to pay any one but the king. Is this not so? Well, so it is with us. If we are sons of God, then we are bound to no one but God, and free from all obligations. And if they demand taxes of you, then pay. But do so, not because it is your duty, but because you may not resist evil. Otherwise resistance to evil will cause a greater evil." 27.

Another time, the orthodox joined with Cæsar's officials, and went to Jesus, to entrap him in his words. They said to him: "You teach every one according to the truth. Tell us, are we bound to pay taxes to Cæsar or not?" Jesus understood that they wished to convict him of not acknowledging duty to Cæsar. And he said to them: "Show me that with which you pay taxes to Cæsar." xxii. 16.

They handed him a coin. He looked at the coin, and said: "What is this here? Whose effigy and whose signature are these?" They said: "Cæsar's." 17.

And he said: "Well then, pay Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, but that 18.

19.

20.

21.

which is God's, your soul, give to no one but to God." Money, goods, your labor, give everything to him who shall ask it of you. But your soul, give to none but God.

Mt. xxiii. 15. "Your orthodox teachers go about everywhere, and compel people to swear and vow that they will fulfil the law. But by this they only pervert people, and make them worse than before. It is impossible to promise with one's
16- body for one's soul. In your soul, God is;
22. therefore people cannot promise for God to men.

"Beware. Temptation under the fourth commandment is the temptation for men to judge and execute people, and call upon others to take part in these judgments and executions."

Lk. ix. 52. The disciples of Jesus once went into a village, and asked for a night's lodging; but they
53. were not admitted. Then the disciples went
54. to Jesus to complain, and said: "Let these
55. people be struck with lightning." Jesus said: "You still do not understand of what spirit you
56. are. I am teaching, not how to destroy, but how to save people."

xii. 13. Once a man came to Jesus, and said: "Bid my
14. brother give me my inheritance." Jesus said to him: "No one has made me judge over you, and I judge no one. And neither may you judge any one."

Jn. viii. 3. The orthodox once brought a woman to
4. Jesus, and said: "See, this woman was taken
5. in adultery. Now, by the law she should be stoned to death. What do you say?"

6. Jesus answered nothing, and waited for them
7. to bethink themselves. But they pressed him, and asked what he would adjudge to this woman. Then he said: "He among you who is without fault, let him be the first to cast a
8. stone at her." He said nothing more.

9. Then the orthodox looked within themselves,

and their consciences smote them; and they who were in front sought to get behind the others, and all went away. And Jesus remained alone with the woman. He looked round, and saw that there was none else. "Well," said he to the woman, "has no one condemned you?" She said: "No one." Then he said: "And I do not condemn you. Go, and henceforth sin no more."

Jn. viii. 10.

11.

Beware. Temptation against the fifth commandment is the temptation for men to consider themselves bound to do good only to their countrymen, and to consider foreigners as enemies.

A teacher of the law wished to try Jesus, and said: "What am I to do in order to receive the true life?" Jesus said: "You know, — love your Father, God, and him who is your brother through your Father, God; of whatever country he may be." And the teacher of the law said: "This would be well, if there were not different nations; but as it is, how am I to love the enemies of my own people?"

Lk. x. 25.

27.

29.

And Jesus said: "There was a Jew who fell into misfortune. He was beaten, robbed, and abandoned on the road. A Jewish priest went by, glanced at the wounded man, and went on. A Jewish Levite passed, looked at the wounded man, and also went by. But there came a man of a foreign, hostile nation, a Samaritan. This Samaritan saw the Jew, and did not think of the fact that Jews have no esteem for the Samaritans, but pitied the poor Jew. He washed and bound his wounds, and carried him on his ass to an inn, paid money for him to the innkeeper, and promised to come again to pay for him. Thus shall you also behave toward foreign nations, toward those who hold you of no account and ruin you. Then you will receive true life."

30.

31.

32.

33.

34.

35.

Mt. xvi. 21. Jesus said: "The world loves its own, and hates God's people. Therefore men of the world — priests, preachers, officials — will harass those who shall fulfil the will of the Father. And I am going to Jerusalem, and shall be persecuted and killed. But my spirit cannot be killed, but will remain alive."

Mk. viii. 32. Having heard that Jesus would be tortured and killed in Jerusalem, Peter was sad, and took Jesus by the hand, and said to him: "If so,
33. then you had better not go to Jerusalem." Then Jesus said to Peter: "Do not say this. What you say is temptation. If you fear tortures and death for me, this means that you are not thinking of that which is godly, of the spirit, but are thinking of what is worldly."

34. And having called the people and his disciples, Jesus said: "He who wishes to live according to my teaching, let him forsake his fleshly life, and let him be ready for all fleshly suffering; because he who fears for his fleshly life, shall destroy the true life; he who despises the fleshly life, shall save the true life."

Mt. xxii. 23. And they did not understand this, and certain materialists coming, he explained to all what is the meaning of the true life and the awakening from death.

The materialists said that after the fleshly
24. death there is no longer any life. They asked: "How can all rise from the dead? If all were to rise, then in rising they could in no way have
25. life together. For instance, there were seven brothers among us. The first married and died. The wife was taken by the second brother and
28. he died, and she was taken by the third, who also died, and so on unto the seventh. Well now, how shall these seven brothers live with one wife if all arise from the dead?"

Lk. xx. 34. Jesus said to them: "You either purposely confuse things, or you do not understand what

the awakening to life is. Men in this present life marry. But they who shall earn everlasting life, and the awakening from death, do not marry. And that because they can no longer die, but are united with the Father. In your writings, it is said that God said: 'I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.' And this was said when Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had died from among men. It follows, that they who have died from among men are alive to God. If God is, and God does not die, then they who are with God are always alive. The awakening from death is, to live in the will of the Father. For the Father, there is no time; therefore in fulfilling the will of the Father, in joining Him, man departs from time and death."

Lk. xx. 35

36

Mt. xxii. 31.

32

When they heard this, the orthodox no longer knew what to devise to compel Jesus to hold his tongue; and together they began to question Jesus. And one of the orthodox said: "Teacher, what, in your opinion, is the chief commandment in the whole law?"

34

35

36

The orthodox thought that Jesus would get confused in the answer about the law. But Jesus said: "It is, to love the Lord with all one's soul, in whose power we are. From it the second commandment follows, which is, to love one's neighbor. Because the same Lord is in him. And this is the substance of all that is written in all your books."

37

39

40

And Jesus said further: "In your opinion, what is Christ? Is he some one's son?" They said: "In our opinion, Christ is the son of David." Then he said to them: "How, then, does David call Christ his Lord? Christ is neither son of David, nor any one's son after the flesh; but Christ is that same Lord, our Ruler, whom we know in ourselves as our life. Christ is that understanding which is in us."

42

43

And Jesus said: "See, beware of the leaven Lk. xii. 1

Lk. xii. 5. of orthodox teachers. And beware of the leaven of the materialists and of the leaven of the government. But most of all, beware of the leaven of the self-styled 'orthodox,' because in them is the chief stumbling-block."

xx. 45. And when the people understood of what he was speaking, he repeated: "Most of all, be-

46. ware of the teaching of the scholars, of the

Mt. xxiii. 2. self-called 'orthodox.' Beware of them, because they have taken the place of the prophets who declared the will of God to the people.

They have perversely assumed authority to preach to the people the will of God. They preach words, and do nothing. And the result

3. is that they no more than say: 'Do this and that.' And there is no further result, because

4. they do nothing good, but only talk. And they tell people to do what is impossible to be done,

5. and they themselves do nothing. They only labor to keep the teaching in their own hands; and with this aim they strive to appear impos-

8. sible. Know, therefore, that no one should

13. call himself teacher and leader. But the self-styled orthodox are called teachers, and by this very thing they hinder you from entering into the kingdom of heaven, where they themselves

15. do not enter. These orthodox think that people may be brought to God by exterior rites

16. and pledges. Like blind men, they do not see that the outside show means nothing; that all

23. depends upon the soul of man. They do the easiest thing, the external thing; that which is needful and difficult—love, compassion, truth

28. —they leave undone. It suffices them to be only outwardly in the law, and to bring others

27. outwardly to the law. And therefore they, like painted coffins, outwardly look clean, but are

30. an abomination within. They outwardly honor 31. the holy martyrs. But in very deed they are the

same as those who torture and kill the saints. They were before, and are now, the enemies of all good. From them comes all the evil in the world; because they hide the good, and instead of it uphold evil. Most of all to be feared, therefore, are self-called teachers. Because you yourselves know every mistake may be made good. But if people are mistaken as to what good is, this mistake can never be set right. And this is precisely the condition of self-called leaders." Mk. iii. 28

And Jesus said: "I wished, here in Jerusalem, to join all men in one understanding of true happiness; but the people here are only capable of putting to death the teachers of good. And therefore they will remain the same godless people as they were, and will not know the true God; until they shall lovingly welcome the understanding of God." And Jesus went away from the temple. Mt. xxiii. 37.

Then his disciples said to him: "But what will happen to this temple of God, with all its embellishments which people have brought into it, to give to God." And Jesus said: "I tell you truly, the whole of this temple, with all its embellishments, shall be destroyed, and nothing shall remain of it. There is one temple of God; that is, the hearts of men when they love each other." 38.

And they asked him: "When shall there be such a temple?" And Jesus said to them: "That will not be soon. People will yet long be deceived in the name of my teaching, and wars and rebellions will be the result. And there will be great lawlessness, and little love. But when the true teaching shall spread among all men, then will be the end of evil and temptations." 39.
xxiv. 1.
3.
4.
11.
14.

CHAPTER X

THE WARFARE WITH TEMPTATION

Therefore, not to fall by temptation, we must, at every moment of life, be at one with the Father

(“Lead us not into temptation”)

- Lk. xi. 53. AFTER this, the orthodox chief priests began to do all they could to lay traps for Jesus, in some way or other to destroy him. They gathered in council, and began to consider. They said: “This man must somehow or other be put an end to. He so proves his teaching that, if he be left alone, all will believe in him, and cast off our belief. Already half of the people believe in him. But if the Jews believe in his teaching, that all men are sons of one Father, and brothers, and that there is nothing in our Hebrew people different from other peoples, then the Romans will completely overwhelm us, and the Hebrew kingdom will be no more.”
- Lk. xix. 47. And the orthodox high priest and learned men for long counseled together, and could not think what to do with Jesus. They could not make up their minds to kill him.
- Jn. xi. 49. Then one of them, Caiaphas, the chief priest of that year, thought of the following device. He said to the others: “You must remember this: it is expedient to kill one man, that the whole people may not perish. If we leave this man alone, the people will perish; this I declare to you. Therefore it is better to kill Jesus. Even if the people do not perish, they will nevertheless go astray, departing from the one belief, if we do not kill Jesus. Therefore it is better to kill Jesus.”
53. And when Caiaphas said this, they resolved

that there was no need to discuss, but that Jesus must be killed without fail.

They would have taken Jesus at once and killed him, but he withdrew from them into the desert. But at this time the feast of the Passover was approaching, when a great multitude always gathered in Jerusalem. And the orthodox high priests reckoned upon Jesus coming with the people to the feast. And they made known to the people that if any one should see Jesus he should bring him to them.

And it so happened that, six days before the Passover, Jesus said to his disciples: "Let us go to Jerusalem." And he went with them.

And the disciples said to him: "Do not go into Jerusalem. The high priests have resolved now to stone you to death. If you come they will kill you."

Jesus said to them: "I can fear nothing, because I live in the light of understanding. And as every man, that he may not stumble, walks by day and not by night, so every man, that he may doubt nothing and fear nothing, must live by this understanding. Only he doubts and fears who lives by the flesh; but he who lives by understanding, for him there is nothing doubtful or fearful."

And Jesus came to the village of Bethany, near Jerusalem, and to the house of Martha and Mary which was there.

Early in the morning Jesus went into Jerusalem. There was a great crowd for the feast. And when they recognized Jesus, they surrounded him, tore branches from the trees, and threw their clothes before him on the road, and all shouted: "Here is our true king, he who has taught us the true God."

Jesus sat upon an ass's foal, riding, and the people ran before him and shouted; thus he rode into Jerusalem. And when he had thus

Jn. xl. 54.

55.

56.

57.

xii. 1.

xi. 7.

8.

9.

10.

xii. 1.

12.

13.

14.

Mt. xxi. 10.

ridden into the town, the whole people were excited, and asked: "Who is he?" They who knew him answered: "Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth, in Galilee."

Mt. xxi. 11. And Jesus went into the temple, and again drove out thence all the buyers and sellers.

Jn. xii. 19. And the orthodox high priests saw all this, and said to each other: "See what this man is doing. The whole people are following him."

Mk. xi. 18. But they did not dare to take him straight from among the people, because they saw that the people were gathering round him, and they bethought them how to take him by cunning.

Jn. xii. 20. Meanwhile Jesus was in the temple, and taught the people. Among the people, besides Jews, there were Greeks and heathen. The Greeks heard of the teaching of Jesus, and understood his teaching in this way, namely, that he taught the truth, not only to Hebrews
21. but to all men. Therefore they wished to be also his disciples, and spoke about this to
22. Philip. And Philip told this to Andrew.

These two disciples feared to bring Jesus together with the Greeks. They were afraid lest the people should be angry with Jesus, because he did not recognize any difference between Hebrews and other nations, and they long wavered about telling this to Jesus; but afterward both together told him, and hearing that the Greeks wished to be his followers, Jesus was troubled. He knew that the people hated him because he made no difference between the Hebrews and the heathen, but acknowledged himself to be the same as the heathen.

23. He said: "The hour is come to explain what I understand by the Son of Man, though I perish because, in explaining this, I destroy distinction between Jews and heathen. I must

speak the truth. A grain of wheat will only
 bring forth fruit when it itself perishes. He
 who loves his fleshly life loses the true life, and
 he who despises the fleshly life keeps it for the
 everlasting life. He who wishes to follow my
 teaching, let him do as I do. And he who
 does as I do shall be rewarded by my Father.
 My soul is now wrestling. Shall I surrender
 myself to the compromises of temporary life,
 or fulfil the will of the Father, now, at this
 hour? And what then? Surely now, when
 this hour is come in which I am living, I shall
 not say: 'Father, save me from that which I
 should do.' I cannot say this for the sake of
 my life. And therefore I say: 'Father, show
 yourself in me.'"
Jn. xii. 24
25.

26.
27.

28.

And Jesus said: "Henceforth the present
 society of men is condemned to destruction.
 From now that which rules this world shall be
 destroyed. And when the Son of Man shall
 be exalted above the earthly life, then shall
 he unite all in one."
31.

32.

Then the Jews said to him: "We under-
 stand from the law what the everlasting Christ
 is; but why do you say that the Son of Man
 shall be exalted? What is the meaning of
 exalting the Son of Man?"
34.

To this Jesus answered: "To exalt the
 Son of Man, means to live by the life of under-
 standing that is in you. To exalt the Son
 of Man above that which is earthly, means to
 believe in the light while there is light, in
 order to be a son of understanding.
35.
36.

"He who believes in my teaching believes
 not in me, but in that spirit which gave life
 to the world. And he who understands my
 teaching, understands that spirit which gave
 life to the world. But if any one hears my
 words and does not fulfil them, it is not I who
 blame him, seeing that I came, not to accuse,
44.
45.
47

Jn. xii. 48. but to save. He who does not accept my words is accused, not by my teaching, but by the understanding which is in himself. This
49. it is which accuses him. I did not speak of myself, but said what my Father, the living
50. spirit in me, suggested to me. That which I say, the spirit of understanding has told me, and that which I teach is the true life."

36. And having said this, Jesus went away, and again hid from the chief priests.

42. And of those who heard these words of Jesus, many of the powerful and wealthy people believed, but were afraid to acknowledge it to the chief priests, because not one of these priests believed and acknowledged it.
43. They were accustomed to judge according to man, and not according to God.

Mt. xxvi. 3. After Jesus had hidden, the high priests and the elders again met in the court of Caiaphas.

4. And they began to plan how to take Jesus
5. unknown to the people, for they were afraid
14. to seize him openly. And there came to their council one of the first twelve disciples of

15. Jesus, Judas Iscariot, who said: "If you wish to take Jesus secretly, so that the people may not see, I will find a time when there will be few people with him, and will show you where he is; and then take him. But what will you give me for this?" They promised him for

16. this thirty silver coins. He agreed; and from that time began to seek an opportunity to bring the chief priests upon Jesus, in order to take him.

17. Meanwhile Jesus withdrew from the people, and with him were only his disciples. When the first feast of unleavened bread approached, the disciples said to Jesus: "Where, then, shall

18. we keep the Passover?" And Jesus said: "Go into some village, and enter some one's house, and say that we have not time to prepare the

feast, and ask him to admit us to celebrate the Passover." And the disciples did so; they asked a man in the village, and he invited them in. And they came and sat down to the table, Jesus and the twelve disciples, Judas among them. Mt. xxvi. 19
20

Jesus knew that Judas Iscariot had already promised to betray him to death, but he did not accuse Judas for this, or show him ill-will, but as in all his life he taught his disciples love, so even now he only reproached Judas lovingly. When they all twelve were seated at table, he looked at them, and said: "Among you sits he who has betrayed me. Yes, he who eats and drinks with me shall also destroy me." And he said nothing more, so that they did not know of whom he spoke, and they began to sup. Jn. xiii. 11.
Mt. xxvi. 21.
Mk. xiv. 18.
Mt. xxvi. 23.

When they began to eat, Jesus took a loaf and broke it into twelve parts, and gave each of the disciples a piece, and said: "Take and eat, this is my body." And he then filled a cup with wine, handed it to the disciples, and said: "Drink, all of you, of this cup." And when they had all drunk, he said: "This is my blood. I shed it that people may know my will, to forgive others their sins. For I shall soon die, and be no more with you in this world, but shall join you only in the kingdom of heaven." 26.
27.
28.
Lk. xxii. 18

After this, Jesus got up from the table, girt himself with a towel, took a ewer of water, and began to wash the feet of all the disciples. And he came to Peter; and Peter said: "But why will you wash my feet?" Jesus said to him: "It seems strange to you that I should wash your feet; but you will know soon why I do this. Though you are clean, yet not all of you are so, but among you is my betrayer, to whom I gave, with my own hand, bread and wine, and whose feet I wish to wash." Jn. xiii. 4.
5.
6.
7.
10

- Jn. xiii. 12. When Jesus had washed all their feet, he again sat down, and said: "Do you understand
14. why I did this? It was so that you always may do the same for each other. I, your teacher, do this, that you may know how to
17. behave toward those who do you evil. If you have understood this, and will do it, then you will
18. be happy. When I said that one of you will betray me, I did not speak of all of you, because only a single one of you, whose feet I washed, and who ate bread with me, will betray me."
21. And having said this, Jesus was troubled in spirit, and yet again said: "Yes, yes, one of you will betray me."
22. And again the disciples began to look round at each other, not knowing of whom he spoke.
23. One disciple sat near to Jesus, and Simon
24. Peter signed to him in a way to ask who
25. the betrayer was. The disciple asked. And
26. Jesus said: "I will soak a piece of bread, and give it to him: and he to whom I shall give it
27. is my betrayer." And he gave the bread to Judas Iscariot, and said to him: "What you
30. wish to do, do quickly." Then Judas understood that he must go out, and as soon as he had taken the bread he forthwith went out. And it was impossible to follow him, as it was night.
31. And when Judas was gone out, Jesus said: "It is now clear to you what the Son of Man is. It is now clear to you that in him God is, to make him as blessed as God Himself.
33. "Children! I have not long now to be with you. Do not equivocate over my teaching, as I said to the orthodox, but do that which I do.
34. I give you this, a new commandment. As I always, and to the end, have loved you all, do you always, and to the end, love each other.
35. By this only will you be distinguished. Seek to be only thus distinguished from other people. Love one another."

And after this, they went to the Mount of Olives. Mt. xxvi. 30.

And on the way Jesus said to them: "See, 31.
the time is coming when that shall happen
which is written, the shepherd shall be killed,
and all the sheep shall be scattered. And
to-night this shall happen. I shall be taken,
and you will all abandon me, and scatter."

Peter said to him in answer: "Even if all 33.
shall be frightened, and scatter, I will not deny
you. I am ready for prison and for death with
you."

And Jesus said to him: "But I tell you that 34.
this very night, before cock-crow, after I have
been taken, you will deny me, not once, but
thrice."

But Peter said that he would not deny him; 35.
and the other disciples averred the same.

Then Jesus said to the disciples: "Before, Lk. xxii. 35.
neither I nor you had need of anything. You
went without wallet and without change of
shoes, and I so bade you do. But now, if I 36.
am accounted an outlaw, we can no longer do
so, but we must be furnished with everything,
and with swords, that we may not perish in
vain."

And the disciples said: "See, we have two 38.
swords."

Jesus said: "It is well."

And having said this, Jesus went with the fol- Mt. xxvi. 36.
lowers into the garden of Gethsemane. Jn. xviii. 1. Com-
ing into the garden, he said: "Wait you here,
but I wish to pray."

And while near to Peter and the two brothers, Mt. xxvi. 37.
sons of Zebedee, he began to feel weary and sad,
and he said to them: "I feel very sad and my 38.
soul is full of the anguish before death. Wait
here, and be not cast down as I am."

And he went off a little way, lay on the ground 39
on his face, and began to pray, and said: "My

Father, the Spirit! Let it be not as I will, which is that I should not die, but let it be as Thou wilt. Let me die, but for Thee, as a spirit, all is possible; let it be that I may not fear death, that I may escape the temptation of the flesh."

Mt. xxvi. 40.

And then he arose, went up to the disciples, and saw that they were cast down. And he said to them: "How is it you have not strength for one hour to keep up your spirit even as I!

41. Keep up your spirit, so as not to fall into the temptation of the flesh. The spirit is strong, the flesh is weak."

42. And again Jesus went away from them, and again began to pray, and said: "Father, if I must suffer, must die, and am about to die, then
43. so let it be. Let Thy will be done." And having said this, he again went up to the disciples, and saw that they were still more cast down, and ready to weep.

44. And he again went away from them, and the third time said: "Father, let Thy will be done."

45. Then he returned to the disciples, and said to them: "Now be easy, and be calm, because it is now decided that I shall give myself into the hands of worldly men."

CHAPTER XI

THE FAREWELL DISCOURSE

The self-life is an illusion which comes through the flesh, an evil. The true life is the life common to all men

("Deliver us from evil")

Jn. xiii. 36.

AND Peter said to Jesus: "Whither are you going?"

Jesus answered: "You will not have the strength now to go whither I am going; but afterward you will go the same way."

And Peter said : " Why do you think that I have not the strength now to follow whither you go ? I will give up my life for you." Jn. xiii. 37

And Jesus said : " You say that you will give up your life for me, and yet even before cock-crow you shall deny me thrice." And Jesus said to the disciples : " Be not troubled and be not afraid, but believe in the true God of life, and in my teaching." 38

" The life of the Father is not only that which is on earth, but there is another life also. If there were only such a life as the life here, I would say to you, that when I die I shall go into Abraham's bosom, and make ready a place there for you, and I shall come and take you, and we shall together live happily in Abraham's bosom. But I point out to you only the direction to life." xiv. 1.

Thomas said : " But we do not know whither you go, and therefore we cannot know the way. We want to know what there will be after death." 2.

Jesus said : " I cannot show you what will be there ; my teaching is the way, and the truth, and the life. And it is impossible to be joined with the Father of life otherwise than through my teaching. If you fulfil my teaching, you shall know the Father." 3.

Philip said : " But who is the Father ? " 4.

And Jesus said : " The Father is He who gives life. I have fulfilled the will of the Father, and therefore by my life you may know wherein is the will of the Father. I live by the Father, and the Father lives in me. All that I say and do, I do by the will of the Father. My teaching is, that I am in the Father and the Father is in me. If you do not understand my teaching, yet you see me and my works. And therefore you may understand what the Father is. And you know that he who shall follow my teaching may do the same as I ; and yet more, because I shall 5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

- Jn. xiv.** 13. die, but he will still live. He who shall live according to my teaching, shall have all that he wishes, because then the Son will be one with
14. the Father. Whatever you may wish that accords with my teaching, all that you shall
15. have. But for this you must love my teaching.
16. My teaching will give you, in my place, an intercessor and comforter. This comforter will be
17. the consciousness of truth, which worldly men do not understand; but you will know it in your-
18. selves. You never will be alone, if the spirit of
19. my teaching is with you. I shall die, and worldly men will not see me; but you will see me because my teaching lives and you will live
20. by it. And then, if my teaching shall be in you, you will understand that I am in the Father and
21. the Father in me. He who shall fulfil my teaching, shall feel in himself the Father; and in him my spirit shall live."
22. And Judas, not Iscariot, but another, said to him: "But why, then, may not all live by the spirit of truth?"
23. Jesus said in answer: "Only he who fulfils my teaching, only him the Father loves, and in
24. him only can my spirit abide. He who does not fulfil my teaching, him my Father cannot love, because this teaching is not mine, but the
25. Father's. This is all that I can tell you now.
26. But my spirit, the spirit of truth, which shall take up its abode in you after I am gone, shall reveal to you all, and you shall recall and understand much of that which I have told
27. you. So that you may always be calm in spirit, not with that worldly calm which men of the world seek, but with that calm of spirit in
28. which we no longer fear anything. On this account, if you fulfil my teaching, you have no reason to grieve over my death. I, as the spirit of truth, will come to you, and, together with the knowledge of the Father, will take up

my abode in your heart. If you fulfil my teaching, then you must rejoice, because instead of me you will have the Father with you in your heart, and this is better for you.

“My teaching is the tree of life. The Father is He who tends the tree. He prunes and cherishes those branches upon which there is fruit, that they may yield more. Keep my teaching of life, and life will be in you. And as a shoot lives not of itself, but out of the tree, so do you live by my teaching. My teaching is the tree, you are the shoots. He who lives by my teaching of life yields much fruit; and without my teaching there is no life. He who does not live by my teaching withers and dies; and the dry branches are cut off and burnt.

“If you will live by my teaching, and fulfil it, then you shall have all that you desire. Because the will of the Father is, that you may live the true life and have that which you desire. As the Father gave me happiness, so I give you happiness. Hold to this happiness. I am living, because the Father loves me and I love the Father; do you also live by the same love. If you will live by this, you shall be blessed.

“My commandment is, that you love one another as I have loved you. There is no greater love than to sacrifice one's life for the love of one's own, as I have done.

“You are my equals, if you do that which I have taught you. I do not hold you as slaves, to whom orders are given, but as equals; because I have made clear to you all that I have known of the Father. You do not, of your own will, choose my teaching; but because I have pointed out to you that only truth by which you will live, and from which you will have all that you wish.

Jn. xv. 1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

John. xv. 17. "The teaching is summed up in this — Love one another.

18. "If the world should hate you, then do not
19. wonder; it hates my teaching. If you were
at one with the world, it would love you. But
20. I have severed you from the world, and for
21. that it will hate you. If they persecuted me,
22. they will persecute you also. They will do
all this, because they do not know the true
23. God. I explained to them, but they did not
24. wish to hear me. They did not understand
my teaching, because they did not under-
25. stand the Father. They saw my life, and my
26. life showed them their error. And for this
they still more hated me. The spirit of truth
which shall come to you will confirm this
27. to you. And you will accept it. I tell you

xvi. 1. this beforehand, so that you may not be
deceived when persecutions shall be upon
2. you. You shall be made outcasts; men shall
think that in killing you they do God's pleas-
3. ure. All this they cannot help doing, be-
cause they understand neither my teaching
4. nor the true God. All this I tell you before-
hand, so that you may not wonder when it
comes about.

5. "Well then, I now go away to that Spirit
which sent me; and now you understand, you
6. need not ask me whither I go. But before,
you were grieved that I did not tell you whither,
to what place, I depart.

7. "But I tell you truly that it is well for you
that I am going. If I do not die, the spirit of
truth will not appear to you, but if I die, it
8. will take up its abode in you. It will take
up its abode in you, and it will be clear
to you where untruth is, where truth is,
9. and how to make decision. Untruth, in
that people do not believe in the life of the
10. spirit. Truth, in that I am one with the

Father. Decision, in that the power of the fleshly life is at an end. Jn. xvi. 11

“I would say yet much more to you, but it is difficult for you to understand. But when the spirit of truth dwells in you, it will show you the whole truth, because it will tell you, not a new thing of its own, but that which is of God; and it will show you the way in all concerns of life. It also will be from the Father, as I am from the Father; therefore it also will tell you the same as I tell you. 12.
13.
15.

“But when I, the spirit of truth, shall be in you, you will not always see me. Sometimes you will, and sometimes you will not, hear me.” 16.

And the disciples said one to another: “What does he mean when he says: ‘Sometimes you will see me, sometimes you will not see me.’ What means this, ‘Sometimes you will, sometimes you will not’?” 17.
18.

Jesus said to them: “Do you not understand what this means, ‘Sometimes you will, sometimes you will not, see me’? You know how it always is in the world, that some are sad and grieved, while others rejoice. And you will grieve, but your grief will pass into joy. A woman, when she bears, grieves while she is in the pangs of childbirth; but when that is ended, she does not remember the pangs, for joy that a man is born into the world. And so you will grieve; anon you will see me, the spirit of truth will enter into you, and your grief will be turned into joy. Then you will no longer ask anything of me, because you will have all that you wish. Then all which one of you desires in the spirit, all that he will have from his Father. 19.
20.
21.
22.
23.

“You formerly asked for nothing for the spirit; but now ask what you will for the spirit, and you will have all; so that your 24.

- fn. xvi. 25. bliss will be full. Now I, as a man, cannot tell you this clearly in words, but when I, as the spirit of truth, shall live in you, I will proclaim to you clearly about the Father.
26. Then it will not be I who will give you all you ask of the Father in the name of the spirit.
27. But the Father will Himself give, because He loves you for having received my teaching.
28. You have understood that understanding proceeds from the Father into the world and returns from the world to the Father."
29. Then the disciples said to Jesus: "Now we have understood everything, and have
30. nothing more to ask, we believe that you are from God."
33. And Jesus said: "All that I have said to you is in order that you may have confidence and rest in my teaching. Whatever ills may befall you in the world, fear nothing: my teaching will conquer the world."
- xvii. 1. After this, Jesus raised his eyes to heaven, and said:
- "My Father! Thou hast given Thy Son the freedom of life in order that he may receive the true life. Life is the knowledge of the true God of the understanding, Who is
3. discovered to me. I have discovered Thee to
6. men on earth; I have done that work which
4. Thou hast bidden me do. I have shown Thy
6. being to men on earth. They were Thine before, but by Thy will I have discovered to
7. them the truth, and they know Thee. They
8. have understood that all they have, their life, is from Thee only, and that I have taught them, not of myself, but as proceeding, I with
9. them, from Thee. But I pray to Thee for
10. those who acknowledge Thee. They have
11. understood that all that I have is Thine, and all that is Thine is mine. I am no longer in the world, for I return to Thee; but they are in

the world, and therefore I pray Thee, Father, to preserve in them Thy understanding. I do not pray Thee to remove them from the world, but to free them from evil; to confirm them in Thy truth. Thy understanding is the truth. My Father! I wish them to be as I am; to understand as I do, that the true life began before the beginning of the world. That they should all be one; as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, so they may also be one in me. I in them, Thou in me, so that all may be one; so that all men may understand they are not self-created, but that Thou, in love, hast sent them into the world as Thou didst send me. Father of truth! the world did not know Thee, but I knew Thee, and they have known Thee through me. And I have made plain to them what Thou art. Thou art in me, that the love with which Thou hast loved me may be in them also. Thou gavest them life, and therefore didst love them. I have taught them to know this, and to love Thee; so that Thy love might be returned from them to Thee."

Jn. xvii. 15.

17,
18.

21.

23.

25.

26.

CHAPTER XII

THE VICTORY OF THE SPIRIT OVER THE FLESH

Therefore, for him who lives, not the self-life, but a common life in the will of the Father, there is no death. Bodily death is for him union with the Father

("Thine is the kingdom, power, and glory")

AFTER this, Jesus said: "Now arise, and let us go; already he is coming who will betray me."

Mt. xxvi. 46

And he had hardly said this, when suddenly Judas, one of the twelve disciples, appeared, and with him a great throng of people with

47

Mt. xxvi. 48. sticks and swords. Judas said to them: "I will bring you where he and his followers are, and so that you may know him among them all, he whom I shall first kiss, that is he."

49. And he straightway went up to Jesus, and said: "Hail, teacher!" and kissed him.

50. And Jesus said to him: "Friend, why are you here?"

Then the guard surrounded Jesus, and wished to take him.

51. And Peter snatched the sword from the high priest's servant, and slashed the man's ear.

52. But Jesus said: "You must not oppose evil. Cease." And he said to Peter: "Return the sword to him from whom you took it; he who shall draw the sword, shall perish with the sword."

55. And after this, Jesus turned to the crowd, and said: "Why have you come out against me, as against a robber, with arms? I was every day among you in the temple, and taught you, and you did not take me. But now is your hour, and the power of darkness."

Lk. xxii. 53.

Mt. xxvi. 56. Then, having seen that he was taken, all the disciples ran away.

Jn. xviii. 12. And the officer ordered the soldiers to take Jesus, and bind him. The soldiers bound him,

13. and took him first to Annas. This was the father-in-law of Caiaphas, and Caiaphas was the high priest for that year, and lived in the

14. same house with Annas. This was the same Caiaphas who planned how to destroy Jesus. He held that it was good for the sake of the people to destroy Jesus, because, if that were not done, it would be worse for the whole people. And they took Jesus to the house where this high priest lived.

Mk. xiv. 53.

Mt. xxvi. 58. When they had brought Jesus thither, one of his disciples, Peter, followed him from afar,

and watched where they were taking him. When they brought Jesus into the court of the high priest, Peter went in also, to see how all would end. And a girl in the yard saw Peter, and said to him: "You, also, were with Jesus of Galilee." Then Peter was afraid that they would accuse him also, and he said aloud before all the people: "I do not know what you are talking about." Afterward, when they had taken Jesus into the house, Peter also entered the hall, with the people. In the hall, a woman was warming herself at the fire, and Peter approached. The woman looked at Peter, and said to the people: "See, this man is likely to have been with Jesus of Nazareth." Peter was still more frightened, and swore that he never was with him, and did not even know what kind of a man Jesus was. A little while after, the people came up to Peter, and said: "It is quite clear that you also were among the disturbers. By your speech one may know that you are from Galilee." Then Peter began to swear, and aver that he had never known or seen Jesus.

Mt. xxvi. 69

70.

71.

72.

73.

74.

75.

And he had hardly said this, when the cock crew. And Peter remembered those words which Jesus had said to him, when Peter swore that if all denied Jesus, he would not deny him: "Before the cock crow this night, you will deny me thrice." And Peter went out, and cried bitterly. Jesus had prayed that he might not thus fall into temptation. He had fallen into one temptation, that of strife, when he began to defend Jesus; and into another temptation, the fear of death, when he denied Jesus.

And there gathered to the high priest, the orthodox chief priests, assistants, and officials. And when all were assembled, they brought in Jesus; and the chief priests asked him, what was his teaching, and who were his followers.

Mk. xiv. 53.

Jn. xviii. 19.

Jn. xviii. 20. And Jesus answered: "I always said all I had to say before everybody openly, and so I speak now; I concealed nothing from any one, and I conceal nothing now. But about what do you question me? Question those who heard and understood my teaching. They will tell you."

21. 22. When Jesus had said this, one of the high priest's servants struck him in the face, and said: "To whom are you speaking? Is this the way to answer the high priest?"

23. Jesus said: "If I spoke ill, say what I spoke ill. But if I said nothing ill, then there is no cause to beat me."

Mt. xxvi. 59. The orthodox chief priests strove to accuse Jesus, and at first did not find any proofs against him for which it was possible to condemn him.

60. Afterward they found two witnesses. These
61. said about Jesus: "We ourselves heard how this man said: 'I will destroy this temple of yours made with hands, and in three days will build up another temple to God, not made with hands.'" But this evidence, also, was not
59. enough to condemn him. And therefore the
62. high priest called up Jesus, and said: "Why do you not answer their evidence?"

63. Jesus held his tongue, saying nothing. Then the high priest said to him: "Well, say then, Are you the Christ, and of God?"

64. Jesus answered him, and said: "Yes, I am the Christ, and of God. You yourselves will now see that the Son of Man is made like God."

65. Then the high priest cried out: "You blaspheme! Now we do not want any evidence. We all hear, now, that you are a blasphemer."

66. And the high priest turned to the assembly, and said: "You have yourselves heard that he blasphemes God. To what do you sentence him for this?"

And all said: "We sentence him to death."

Then all the people, and the guards, fell upon Jesus, and began to spit in his face, to strike him on the cheeks, and to tear at him. They covered his eyes, hit him in the face, and asked : " Now, prophet, guess who it was that hit you ? " Mt. xxvi. 67
68.

But Jesus held his peace.

Having abused him, they took him, bound, to Pontius Pilate. And they brought him into the court. xxvii. 2.
Jn. xviii. 28.

Pilate, the governor, came out to them and asked : " Of what do you accuse this man ? " 29.

They said : " This man is doing wrong ; so we have brought him to you." 30.

And Pilate said to them : " But if he does wrong, then judge him yourselves according to your law." 31.

And they said : " We have brought him to you that you might execute him, for we are not allowed to kill any one."

And so that happened which Jesus expected. He said that one must be ready to die on the cross at the hands of the Romans, more likely than at the hands of the Jews. 32.

And when Pilate asked, whereof they accused him, they said, that he was guilty of stirring up the people, and that he forbade the payment of taxes to Cæsar, and that he set up himself as Christ and king. Lk. xxiii. 2.

Pilate listened to them, and bade Jesus be brought to him in the court. When Jesus came in, Pilate said to him : " So you are king of the Jews ? " Jn. xviii. 33.

Jesus said to him : " Do you really suppose that I am a king, or are you repeating only that which others have told you ? " 34.

Pilate said : " I am not a Jew, therefore you cannot be my king, but your people have brought you to me. What kind of a man are you ? " 35.

Jn. xviii. 36. Jesus answered: "I am a king; but my kingdom is not an earthly one. If I were an earthly king, my subjects would fight for me, and would not yield to the high priests. But as it is, you see that my kingdom is not an earthly one."

37. Pilate said to this: "But yet, do you not consider yourself a king?" Jesus said: "Not only I, but you also, cannot but consider me a king. For I only teach, in order to discover to all the truth of the kingdom of heaven. And every one who lives by the truth, is a king."

38. Pilate said: "You spoke of truth. What is truth?"

And having said this, he turned, and went to the chief priests. He went out and said to them: "In my opinion, this man has done no wrong."

Mk. xv. 3. But the chief priests insisted upon their opinion, and said that he was doing much evil, and stirring up the people, and had raised the whole of Judea right from Galilee.

4. Then Pilate, in the presence of the chief priests, began to question Jesus. But Jesus did not answer. Pilate then said to him: "Do you hear of what they accuse you? Why do you not justify yourself?"

5. But Jesus still held his tongue, and said not another word, so that Pilate wondered at him.

Lk. xxiii. 6. Pilate remembered that Galilee was in the power of King Herod, and asked: "Ah! he is from Galilee?" They answered: "Yes."

7. Then he said: "If he is from Galilee, then he is under the authority of Herod, and I will send him to him." Herod was then in Jerusalem, and Pilate, in order to rid himself, sent Jesus to Herod.

8. When they brought Jesus to Herod, Herod was very glad to see him. He had heard much

of him, and wished to know what kind of man he was. So he called Jesus to him, and began to question him about all he wished to know. But Jesus answered him nothing. And the chief priests and teachers, just as with Pilate, so before Herod, vehemently accused Jesus, and said that he was a rioter. And Herod deemed Jesus an empty fellow, and to mock him, bade them clothe him in red, and send him back to Pilate. Herod was pleased at Pilate's showing respect to him, by sending Jesus for his judgment, and on this account they became friends, whereas formerly they had been at variance.

Lk. xxiii. 9

10.

11.

12

Now, when they brought Jesus again to Pilate, Pilate called back the chief priests and Jewish authorities, and said to them: "You brought this man to me for stirring up the people, and I have examined him before you, and do not see that he is a rioter. I sent him with you to Herod, and now, see, — nothing wrong is found in him. And, in my opinion, there is no cause to punish him with death. Had you not better punish him and let him go?"

13.

14.

15.

But when the chief priests heard this, all cried out: "No, punish him in the Roman fashion! Stretch him on the cross!" Pilate heard them out, and said to the chief priests: "Well, as you will! But you have a custom at the feast of the Passover to pardon one condemned malefactor. Well, I have lying in prison, Barabbas, a murderer and rioter. Which one of the two must be let free: Jesus or Barabbas?"

Mt. xxvii. 23.

21.

Pilate thus wished to save Jesus; but the chief priests had so worked upon the people, that all cried out: "Barabbas, Barabbas!"

And Pilate said: "And what shall be done with Jesus?"

22.

They again cried out: "Roman fashion, — to the cross, to the cross with him."

Mt. xxvii. 23. And Pilate tried to talk them over. He said: "Why do you press so hardly on him? He has done nothing that he should be punished with death, and he has done you no harm. I will set him free, because I find no fault in him."

6. The chief priests and their servants cried out: "Crucify, crucify him!"

And Pilate said to them: "If so, then take him and crucify him yourselves. But I see no fault in him."

7. The chief priests answered: "We ask only that which our law demands. By our law, he must be executed for having made himself out to be Son of God."

8. When Pilate heard this word, he was troubled, because he did not know what this term "Son of God" meant. And having returned into the court, Pilate called up Jesus again, and asked him: "Who are you, and whence are you?"

But Jesus did not answer.

10. Then Pilate said: "But why do you not answer me? You surely see that you are in my power, and that I can crucify you, or set you free."

11. Jesus answered him: "You have no power. There is power only from above."

12. Pilate, nevertheless, wished to set Jesus free, and he said to them: "How is it you wish to crucify your king?"

13. But the Jews said to him: "If you set Jesus free, you will thereby show that you are a disloyal servant to Cæsar, because he who sets himself up as king is an enemy to Cæsar. Our king is Cæsar; but crucify this man."

13. And when Pilate heard these words, he understood that he could now no longer refuse to execute Jesus.

Then Pilate went out before the Jews, took some water, washed his hands, and said: "I am not guilty of the blood of this just man." And the whole people cried out: "Let his blood be upon us and all our children." Mt. xxvii. 24
25.

So that the chief priests gained the upper hand. And Pilate sat in his place of judgment, and ordered Jesus to be first flogged. Lk. xxiii. 23.
Jn. xix. 13.
Mt. xxvii. 26.

When they had flogged him, the soldiers, who had done this, put a crown upon his head and a rod in his hand, and threw a red cloak over his back, and fell to reviling him; in mockery, they bowed down to his feet, and said: "Hail, king of the Jews!" And others struck him on the cheeks, over the face, and spat in his face. 28,
29.

But the chief priests cried: "Crucify him! Our king is Cæsar! Crucify him!" Jn. xix. 15.

And Pilate bade him be crucified. 16.

Then they stripped Jesus of the red dress, put on him his own clothing, and bade him bear the cross to a place called Golgotha, there to be crucified at once. And he carried his cross, and so came to Golgotha. And there they stretched Jesus on the cross, beside two other men. These two were at the sides, and Jesus was in the middle. Mt. xxvii. 31.
Jn. xix. 18.

When they had crucified Jesus, he said: "Father! forgive them; they do not know what they are doing." Lk. xxiii. 34.

And when Jesus was hung on the cross, the people thronged round him and railed at him. They came up, wagged their heads at him, and said: "So, you wish to destroy the temple of Jerusalem, and to build it up again in three days. Well now, save yourself, come down from the cross!" And the chief priests and leaders stood there also, and mocked at him, and said: "He thought to save others, but cannot save himself. Now show that you are Christ; come 35.
Mk. xv. 29.
30.
31.
32.

down from the cross, and then we will believe you. He said that he was the Son of God, and that God would not forsake him. But how is it that God has now forsaken him?" And the people, and the chief priests, and the soldiers, railed at him, and even one of the robbers crucified with him, he too railed at him.

Lk. xxiii. 39. One of the robbers, reviling him, said: "If you are Christ, save yourself and us."

40. But the other robber heard this and said: "Do you not fear God? You who are yourself on the cross, do you even rail at the innocent? You and I are executed for our deserts, but this man has done no harm."

42. And, turning to Jesus, this robber said to him: "Lord, remember me in your kingdom."

43. And Jesus said to him: "Even now you are blessed with me!"

Mt. xxvii. 46. But at the ninth hour, Jesus, worn out, cried aloud: "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani!" This means: "My God, my God! why hast Thou forsaken me?"

47. And when the people heard this, they began to say jeeringly: "He is calling the prophet Elias! Let us see whether Elias will come!"

Jn. xix. 28. Afterward, Jesus cried out: "Let me drink!"

And a man took a sponge, soaked it in vinegar, that stood by, and gave it to Jesus on a reed.

30. Jesus sucked the sponge, and cried out in a loud voice: "It is finished! Father, I give up

Lk. xxiii. 46. my spirit into your hands!" And, letting his head fall, he gave up the ghost.

A PROLOGUE

THE UNDERSTANDING OF LIFE

The proclamation of Christ has replaced the belief in an external God by the understanding of life

THE Gospel is the revelation of this truth, that the first source of everything is the understanding of life itself. This being so, the Gospel puts in the place of what men call "God" a right understanding of life. Without this understanding there is no life; men only live in so far as they understand life.

Those who do not grasp this, and who deem that the body is the source of life, shut themselves out from true life; but those who comprehend that they live, not through the body, but through the spirit, possess true life. This is that true life which Jesus Christ came to teach to men. Having conceived that man's life flows from the understanding, he gave to men the teaching and example of a life of the understanding in the body.

Earlier religions were the announcements of law as to what men ought to do, and not to do, for the service of God. The teaching of Jesus, on the other hand, deals only with the understanding of life. No man has ever seen, and no man can see or know, an external God; therefore our life cannot take for its aim the service of such a God. Only by adopting for his supreme principle the inner understanding

of life, having for its source the acknowledgment of God, can man surely travel the way of life.

- Mk. i. 1. The announcement of salvation of Jesus
 Jn. xx. 31. Christ, the Son of God. This is the announce-
 ment of salvation ; all men who come to know
 i. 1. they are sons of God receive true life. The
 foundation and beginning of all things is the
 understanding of life. Understanding of life
 2. is God. This the announcement of Jesus
 Christ reveals as the foundation and beginning
 3. of everything. All is built upon the under-
 standing of life, without which there can be
 4. no living. In this is true life.
 5. This understanding is the light of truth.
 But this light shines amid the darkness, and
 9. the darkness is not able to overcome it. The
 true light has always been in the world, and
 shines upon all men who come into the world.
 10. It has been in the world, and the world existed
 only because it contained this light ; but the
 11. world has not adhered to it. This light has
 appeared in its place, but its place has not
 retained it.
 12. All those who have grasped the understand-
 ing of life have received the opportunity of
 13. becoming like it through belief in it. Those
 who have believed that life is in the under-
 standing have become the sons, not of the
 flesh, but of the understanding.
 14. And the understanding of life was united
 with the flesh in the person of Jesus Christ,
 and so we were given to know that the off-
 spring of understanding, man in the flesh, is
 of the same nature as his Father, the original
 source of life.
 15. The teaching of Jesus is the perfect and
 16. true faith. In fulfilling the teaching of Jesus,
 we have understood the new faith which re-

places the old. It was law that Moses gave, Jn. 1. 17.
but we come to understand the true faith
through Jesus Christ.

No man has ever seen God; the Son only, 18.
who is in the Father, has shown us the way
of life.

A SUMMARY

THE UNDERSTANDING OF LIFE IS
TO DO GOOD

*The announcement of blessedness made by Jesus Christ is an
announcement of understanding of life*

THE understanding of life is this: The source of life is perfect goodness, and therefore human life is perfectly good in its nature. To understand the source of life, it is necessary to believe that our spirit, the life in man, came from this source. The man, formerly not living, is summoned into life by this, his origin. This source of life appoints blessedness for man, because its own being is blessedness.

To keep in harmony with the source of his life, a man must fix himself upon the one characteristic of this source which is comprehensible to him, and which finds blessedness in doing good. Therefore man's life must be devoted to this blessedness; that is, to doing good from love. But we can find no objects of goodness other than men. All our own bodily desires are out of harmony with this principle of blessedness; and therefore they, with all the life of the body, must be surrendered to the principle of blessedness, to active love to mankind.

Love to our fellow-men follows from the understanding of life revealed by Jesus Christ. The confirmations of this understanding of life are twofold. One is, that when not ac-

cepted, the source of life seems to be an impostor, who gives to men an unsatisfied craving for life and blessedness. The other is, that man feels in his soul that love and goodness toward his fellow-men is the only true, free, eternal life.

The First Epistle of John the Divine

This is the announcement of the understanding of life through which men have fellowship with the Father of life, and therefore have eternal life. 1 Jn. i. 1-3

This is an announcement of blessedness. 4.

The understanding of life is, that God is life and blessedness, and that in life and blessedness death and evil do not exist. 5.

If we say that we are at one with God, while we feel we are living in evil and death, then either we are imposing upon ourselves, or we are not doing what we ought to do. 6.

Only by living the same life as His, do we become at one with Him. 7.

As a teacher of this life, we have Jesus Christ, the right-living. He freed us and all who will, from wrong-living. ii. 1.

The proof that we know the teaching of Jesus Christ is, that we carry out his commandments. 2.

Any one who says he knows the teaching of Jesus Christ, and does not keep his commandments, is a liar, and there is no truth in him. 3.

But the man who carries out his commandments has the love of God in him. 4.

Only through love can we know that we are at one with God. 5.

He who says he is at one with Jesus Christ, must also live as Jesus lived. 6.

He who says of himself that he is in life and blessedness, but hates his living brother-man, is not in life and blessedness, but in 9-11.

death and evil; and he does not know what he is doing; he is blind, hating the life which is in himself also.

i Jn. ii. 15. To escape this blindness, a man must remember that everything in the world, in the earthly life, is the desire of the flesh, or vanity, and that all this is not from God. And that

16. all this passes away, perishes. And that only

17. he who does the will of God, which is love, endures for ever.

23. Only he who recognizes that his spirit is the offspring of the Father, is united with the

24. Father. Therefore remain in the knowledge that you are, in the spirit, sons of the Father, God, and you will have eternal life.

iii. 1. God gives us the opportunity of being His sons, and like Himself. So that, in this present

2. life, we become His sons. We do not know what we are to be, but we know that we are like Him, and that we are united with Him.

3. Confidence in this eternal life rids us of our mistakes, and purifies us to the Father's purity.

4. For whoever commits sin, violates the will of God.

5. Jesus Christ came to teach us the way to deliverance from sin, and unity with God.

6. Therefore those who become united with Him can no longer sin. Only that man will

7. sin who does not know Him. But he who

8. lives in God, acts righteously; and only he

9. who is not united with God, does unrighteously. He who owns his origin from God, cannot do any falsehood.

10. Therefore men are of two classes — men of God, and men who are not of God; men who know the right and love the brethren, and men who do not know the right and do not love the brethren.

11. For, following the teaching of Jesus Christ,

we cannot refrain from loving one another. Through the teaching of Jesus Christ, we know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren, and that he who does not love his brother is in death. We know that one who does not love his living brother does not love life. And he who does not love life cannot himself possess life. 1 Jn. iii 14

By this teaching we recognize love, in the fact that life is given to us; and we know, therefore, that we also must give up our life for our brother. So that he who, himself having the means of life, sees his brother in need, and does not yield his own life for his brother's sake,—in him there is no divine love. 15.

We must love, not by words, but by deeds, in truth. And he who so loves has a quiet heart, because he is at one with God. 16.

If our heart is at strife in us, we subdue it to God. For God is higher than the wishes of our hearts. But if there is no strife in our hearts, then we are blessed, and that because we do all we can, the best deeds, and fulfil all that is ordained for us. 17.

And this is ordained for us—to believe that man is the son of God, and to love our brother. Those who do this are united with God, and are risen above the world, because that which is in us is greater, of more consequence, than all the world. 18.

Therefore let us love one another. Love is from God, and every one who loves is the son of God, and knows God. And he who does not love, does not know God. Because God is love. iv. 4.

That God is love, we know because He sent into the world this Spirit, such as He Himself is, and thereby gave us life. We did not exist, and God was under no compulsion, but 7.

8.

9.

10.

He gave us life and blessedness; therefore He must love us.

1 Jn. iv. 11-13.

No man can perfectly know God. All we can know of Him is, that He had love toward us, and because of this love gave us life. And to be in fellowship with God, we must be like Him, and do as He does; we must love one another. If we love one another, God dwells in us, and we dwell in Him.

16. Having understood the love of God toward us, we believe that God is love, and that he
17. who loves is united with God. And having understood this, we do not fear death, because
18. in this world we become such as God Himself is. Our life becomes love, and is thus freed from fear and all sufferings.

19. We love, because He loves. And we love not a God whom no one can love, because no one sees Him, but our brother-man, whom it is
20. possible to love. He who says he loves God, and yet hates his brother, is deceiving himself. Because, if he does not love the brother whom he sees, how, then, can he love God whom he
21. does not see? For it is ordained to us to love God in our brother.

v. 3. To love God, is to fulfil His commandments. And these commandments are not hard for
4. him who, recognizing that his origin is from
5. God, rises above the world. Our faith lifts us above the world. And our faith in that which Jesus, the Son of God, taught us, is true. He has taught us that he lived in the world, not merely in the way of truth, but by the power
6. of the spirit. And that spirit is in us, and makes us strong in truth, following out the teaching.

9. If we believe in what men affirm, why, then, should we not believe in the spirit that is in
10. ourselves? He who believes in that spirit of life which is in us, has assurance within him-

self. And he who does not believe that there is a spirit from above us, from the Father, makes God a deceiver.

The spirit in us affirms that our life is eternal. He who knows that this spirit is the offspring of the Infinite Spirit, and becomes like Him, has eternal life. And for him who so believes, there is no difficulty left in his life, but everything he desires in the will of the Father will come to him.

Therefore he who believes himself to be a son of God, will not live in any deception, but is free from evil. Because he knows that this material world is an illusion, and that in man himself there is the capacity to know that which has real existence. And only the Spirit, the Son, the offspring of the Father, really exists.

1 Jn. v. 11.

12.

14.

18.

19.

20.

A RECAPITULATION

CHAPTER I

THE SON OF GOD

Man, the son of God, is powerless in the flesh, and free in the spirit

(“Our Father”)

JESUS in his childhood called God his Father. There arose in Judea, at this time, a prophet named John. John preached the coming of God upon earth. He said that when men should change their lives, when they should treat one another as equals, when they should cease to injure one another, and, instead of so doing, serve one another, then God would appear upon earth, and His kingdom would be established on earth. Jesus, having heard this declaration, withdrew from among men and went into the wild places, to meditate upon the meaning of human life, and upon his relations to that infinite source of all being, called God. And Jesus accepted as his Father that infinite source of being whom John had called God.

After passing days in the wild places without taking food, Jesus began to suffer hunger. Then he thought to himself, “I am the Son of God the Almighty; I ought, then, to be as He is. But now, I wish to eat, and no bread comes for my need; I am not, then, all-powerful.” Then he said to himself, “It is true, I cannot make for myself bread out of stones; but I can overcome the want of bread. So that, though not all-powerful in the body, I am all-powerful in the spirit, and I can quell the body; and thus I am the Son of God, not through the flesh, but through the spirit.”

Then he said: "But if I am the Son of the Spirit, I can free myself of the body, and do away with it." But to that he answered, "I am born as spirit, embodied in flesh. Such is the will of my Father, and I cannot set myself against His will."

"But if you cannot satisfy the wants of your body, and if you are no better able to free yourself from your body," he went on to himself, "you ought, then, to labor for the body, and to enjoy all the pleasures it gives you."

But to that he answered, "I cannot satisfy the wants of my body any better than I can rid myself of it; but my life is all-powerful, in that it is the spirit of my Father; and it follows that in my body I must serve the spirit, my Father, and labor for Him only! And becoming convinced that man's life is only in the spirit of the Father, Jesus left the wild places, and began to declare his teaching to men. He said that the spirit dwelt in him, that henceforth heaven was opened, that the powers of heaven were brought to men, that for men a free and boundless life was begun, and that all men, however unfortunate in the body, may be happy.

CHAPTER II

LIFE IN THE SPIRIT

Therefore man must work, not for the flesh, but for the spirit

("Which art in heaven")

THE Jews, holding themselves orthodox, worshiped an external God, whom they regarded as Creator and Lord of the Universe. According to their teaching, this external God had made an agreement with them. According to this agreement, he had promised the Jews to help them, and they had promised to worship Him; and the chief condition of the alliance was the keeping of the Sabbath.

But Jesus said: "The Sabbath is a human institution. That man shall live in the spirit, is more important than all religious ceremonies. Like all external forms of religion, the keeping of the Sabbath includes in itself a delusion. It is impossible to do nothing on the Sabbath. Good actions must be done at any time; and if keeping the Sabbath prevents good action, then the Sabbath is an error."

Another condition in this agreement with God, was the avoidance of the society of infidels. As to this, Jesus said: "God asks for no sacrifice to Himself, but only that men should love one another."

Still another condition related to the following of rules about washing and cleansing; as to which, Jesus said: "God demands, not outside cleanliness, but only, pity and love toward men." He taught that all such external ceremonies were harmful, and that the church tradition itself was an evil. The church tradition causes men to neglect the most important acts of love, as, for instance, love to father and mother. Of all external ceremonies, of all the ritual of the old law, which had for object, as was held, the purification of men, Jesus said: "Know all of you, that nothing from outside can defile a man; only what he thinks, and what he does, defiles him."

After this, Jesus went to Jerusalem, a town considered holy, entered the temple, where the orthodox believed that God dwelt, and there taught: "It is useless to offer God sacrifices; man is of more consequence than a temple; and the only duty is, to love one's neighbor, and help him."

And he taught, further: "Men need not worship God in any particular place, but they must worship Him in spirit and in act. The spirit cannot be seen or shown. The spirit is man's consciousness of his sonship to the Infinite Spirit. No temple is needed. The true temple is the society of men united in love." He said: "All external worship of the divine is not only false and injurious, as with the Jews, among whom it caused murder and admitted neglect of parents, but harmful,

because one who goes through external ceremonials, thinks himself made righteous, and free from the need of doing what love demands." He said: "Only that man aims at good, and does good, who feels his own imperfection. To do good deeds, a man must think of himself as imperfect. But external acts of worship lead men into the delusion of self-conceit. All external ceremonies are unnecessary, and must be thrown aside. Deeds of love are incompatible with ceremonial performances, and it is impossible to do good in that form. Man is the son of God by the spirit, and therefore must serve the Father in the spirit."

CHAPTER III

THE SOURCE OF LIFE

The life of all men has proceeded from the spirit of the Father

("Hallowed be Thy Name")

JOHN's disciples asked Jesus what was meant by his "Kingdom of God." He said that the Kingdom of God as preached by him was also that preached by John; and that therein every man, however poor, might be blessed.

And Jesus said to the people: "John was the first who preached to men a Kingdom of God which is not of the external world, but is in the soul of man. The orthodox went to hear John, but understood nothing, because they know only those fictions of their own about an external God, which they preach; and they are astonished when no one pays heed to them. But John preached the truth of the Kingdom of God within men, and therefore he did more than them all. He did so much that, since his time, the law and the prophets, and all external forms of divine worship, are superseded. Since he taught, it is made clear that the Kingdom of God is in the soul of man.

"The beginning and the end of all things is in the soul

of man. Every man, in addition to his bodily life, to the fact which he knows as to his conception from a bodily father through a bodily mother, recognizes in himself a free spirit, intelligent, and independent of the body. This very Spirit, infinite, and proceeding from the infinite, is the origin of all, and is what we call God. We know Him only as we recognize Him within us. This Spirit is the source of our life, and must be ranked above everything; and to Him we must live. By making Him the foundation of our life, we gain the true and infinite life.

"The Father-Spirit, who sends this Spirit into men, cannot have sent Him to deceive men, so that, while conscious of Him, they might come to lose Him. This infinite Spirit being in man, He must have been given to the end that men, through Him, might have infinite life. Therefore the man who conceives of this Spirit as his life, has infinite life. The man who does not so conceive, has no true life. Men can of themselves choose life or death. Life,—in the Spirit; death,—in the flesh. The life of the Spirit is goodness, light. The life of the flesh is evil, darkness. To believe in the Spirit means to do good deeds; to disbelieve, means to do evil deeds. Goodness is life; evil is death.

"God, the Creator, external to us, the beginning of all beginnings, we do not know. Our conception of Him can only be this, that He sowed in men the Spirit; sowing, as a sower does, everywhere, not discriminating, over the field; and the seed, falling on good ground, grows, falling on sterile ground, perishes.

"The Spirit alone gives life, and men are responsible for keeping or losing it. To the Spirit, no evil exists. Evil is but an illusion of life. There are only the two conditions, of living and not-living. Thus the world presents itself to every man; and for every man there is in his soul a consciousness of the Kingdom of Heaven. Each one can, by his own free will, enter, or not enter, that Kingdom. To enter, belief in the life of the Spirit is necessary. He who believes in that life of the Spirit, has infinite life."

CHAPTER IV

GOD'S KINGDOM

Therefore the will of the Father is the life and welfare of all men

("Thy kingdom come")

JESUS pitied men because they did not know true blessedness; therefore he taught them. He said: "Blessed are those who have no property, no position, and who do not care for these; and unhappy are they who seek riches and position. Because such poor and oppressed people are in the Father's will; but the rich and acknowledged people seek only to make gain from men for this temporary life. To carry out God's will, one must not fear to be poor and despised, but must rejoice in this, while showing men what true happiness is.

"To carry out the will of the Father, which gives life and welfare, mankind must fulfil five commandments, namely:—

The First Commandment

To do no ill to any one, and to so act as to rouse evil in no one; because from evil comes evil.

The Second Commandment

Not to follow after women, and not to desert the woman with whom a union has once been formed; because desertion and change of wives causes all the world's dissoluteness.

The Third Commandment

To take no oath of any kind; because nothing can be promised, since man is in the Father's power; and oaths, when taken, are for bad ends.

The Fourth Commandment

Not to fight against evil, but to suffer wrong, and to give even more than men would exact from us; not to condemn, and not to use the law; because every man is himself full of errors, and cannot guide others. By taking revenge, we only teach others to revenge.

The Fifth Commandment

To make no difference between a fellow-countryman and a foreigner; because all men are children of one father.

“The observance of these five commandments is necessary, not to win praise from men, but for oneself, for one’s own welfare; therefore there is no propriety in praying and fasting in sight of men.

“The Father knows all that men need, and there is no necessity to pray for particular things; it is simply needful to seek to be in the Father’s will. And this is the will of the Father, that a man shall have no anger toward any other. To keep fasts is not essential, for men may fast merely to win praise from men, and such praise ought to be avoided. It is only necessary carefully to conform to the will of God, and the rest will follow of itself. While caring for the body, care cannot be given to the Kingdom of Heaven. Even though a man does not trouble about food and clothing, he will live on. The Father will give life. The needful thing is, at this present moment, to be in the will of the Father. The Father gives to his children what they need. We must desire only the power of the Spirit, which the Father gives.

“The five commandments mark out the road to the Kingdom of Heaven. This narrow path alone leads to eternal life. False teachers—wolves in the skins of sheep—always try to turn men astray from this road; they must be guarded against. False teachers can always be detected, because they teach evil in the

name of good. If they teach violence and executions, they are false teachers. By the deeds they teach they may be known.

"Not that man does the Father's will, who calls on the name of God; but he who does good deeds. And he who fulfils these five commandments will have secure and true life, of which nothing can deprive him. But he who does not fulfil them will have an insecure life; one soon to be taken from him, leaving him nothing."

The teaching of Jesus filled the people with admiration and joy, because it offered freedom to every one.

The teaching of Christ was the fulfilment of John's prophecy that God's chosen one should bring light to men, overcome evil, and restore truth, by kindness, meekness, and goodness, but not by violence.

CHAPTER V

THE TRUE LIFE

The fulfilment of the personal will leads to death; the fulfilment of the Father's will gives the true life

("Thy will be done")

THE wisdom of life is, the recognition of one's own life as the offspring of the Father's Spirit. Men set before themselves the aims of the bodily life, and in pursuing these aims, they harass themselves and others.

In receiving the doctrine of the spiritual life, and in subjecting and making less of the body, men will find a full satisfaction in the life of the Spirit, in that life which is appointed for them.

Jesus said to his disciples: "The true food of man is the fulfilment of the will of the Father-Spirit. This fulfilment is always possible. Our whole life is a gathering of the fruits of the life sown within us by the Father. Those fruits are the good we are doing among men.

"We ought not to look forward with anxiety for any-

thing. We ought, without ceasing our interest in life, to do good among men."

After this, Jesus happened to be in Jerusalem, where was a bath, beside which lay a sick man, doing nothing but waiting a miracle to cure him. Jesus came, and said to him: "Do not expect a cure by a miracle, but live your life according to your strength, and do not be deluded as to the purpose of life." The invalid obeyed Jesus, got up, and went away.

The orthodox, seeing this, began to reproach Jesus for what he said, and because he had, on the Sabbath, raised an invalid. Jesus said to them: "I did nothing new. I have only the power to act of our common Father, the Spirit. He lives, and gives life to men, and I have done likewise. And to do this is every man's business. Every one is free, and can live, or not live. To live, is to fulfil the will of the Father, which is to do good to others. Not to live, is to fulfil one's own will, not to do good to others. It is in every one's power to do this, or that; to gain life, or to destroy it.

"The true life of man is like this. A master apportioned to his slaves some valuable property, and told each one to work upon what was given to him. Some worked; some did not work, but put out of sight what was given to them. The master demanded an account: and to those who worked, he gave yet more than they had; but from those who did not work, he took away everything."

The portion of valuable property of the master is the Spirit of life in man, who is the son of the Father-Spirit. He who in his life works for the sake of the spirit-life, receives infinite life; he who does not work, is deprived of what was given to him.

The true life is the common life of humanity, and not the life of the individual. Each one must work for the life of others.

After this, Jesus went to a desert place, and many people followed him. At evening, the disciples came, and said: "How shall we feed all these people?" Among the gathering were some who had nothing, and

some who had bread and fish. And Jesus said to his disciples: "Give me all the bread you have." He took the loaves, and gave bread to his disciples, who gave to others, who did likewise. So all ate of others' bread, not consuming all there was, and all were satisfied. And Jesus said: "Act just in this way. It is not necessary that each one should get food for himself, but it is needful to do that which the Spirit in man demands, namely, that each shall share to others what supply there is. The true food of man is the Spirit of the Father. Man lives by the Spirit only. Everything in life must be made subservient to this; for life consists in doing, not one's own will, but the will of the Father of life. And that will is, that the perfect life of the Spirit which is given to men, shall remain in them, and that all shall cherish the life of the Spirit within them until the hour of death. The Father, the source of life, is Spirit. Life consists only in carrying out the will of the Father; and to carry out that will of the Spirit, one must surrender the body. The body is the food, the material for the life of the Spirit. Only in giving up the body does the Spirit live."

After this, Jesus chose certain disciples, and sent them everywhere to preach the doctrine of the life of the Spirit. In sending them, he said: "Preach the life of the Spirit, and, consistently therewith, renounce beforehand all fleshly desires, and have nothing of your own. Be ready for persecution, privation, suffering. Those who love the life of the body will hate you, harass and murder you; but do not fear. If you fulfil the will of the Father, then you possess the life of the Spirit, of which no one can deprive you."

The disciples went away, and when they returned, declared that everywhere the teachings of evil were conquered by them.

Then the orthodox told Jesus that his teaching, even if it conquered evil, was in itself an evil, because those who carry it out must of necessity suffer. To this, Jesus answered: "Evil cannot conquer evil. If evil is conquered, it can only be by good. Goodness

is the will of the Father-Spirit common to all men. Every man has a knowledge of what benefits himself. If he does similar benefits to others, if he does that which is the will of the Father, then he will do good. Therefore the carrying out of the will of the Father-Spirit results well, even though it be followed with sufferings and deaths of those who fulfil that will."

CHAPTER VI

THE FALSE LIFE

Therefore, in order to receive the true life, man must on earth resign the false life of the flesh, and live by the Spirit

("On earth as in heaven")

To the spiritual life there can be no difference between members of one family and strangers. Jesus said that his mother and his brethren, as such, had no superior claims upon him; only those were near to him who fulfilled the will of the common Father. A man's life and welfare depend, not on family relations, but on the life of the Spirit.

Jesus said: "Blessed are those who retain their understanding of the Father. The man who lives by the Spirit has no home, for, being by the Spirit, he cannot own any special house." And he said that he himself had no fixed abode; that not being needed to enable a man to carry out the will of the Father, which can be done at all times, in all places.

The death of the body cannot be dreadful to a man who gives himself up to the will of the Father, because the life of the Spirit goes on despite the death of the body. Jesus said that he who believes in the life of the Spirit has nothing to fear.

No cares make it impossible for a man to live in his Spirit. When a man said that he would obey the teaching of Christ presently, but that he must first bury his father, Jesus answered: "Only the dead trouble about

burial of the dead; but the living live always in fulfilling the will of the Father." Cares about relations and family affairs must not hinder the life of the Spirit. He who troubles about the results to his bodily life from the fulfilment of the Father's will, does as the plowman does, who plows, looking not in front, but behind.

Cares for the pleasures of the bodily life, which seem so important to men, are delusions. The only, the real business of life, is the making plain of the Father's will, attention to it, and fulfilment of it. To Martha's reproach, that she alone troubled about the supper, and that her sister Mary did not help, but listened to his teaching, Jesus said: "You blame her unjustly. Take some trouble, yourself, if you need what comes of it, but let those who do not need pleasures for the body attend to the one essential business of life."

And Jesus said: "He who desires the true life, which comes of fulfilling the Father's will, must first of all give up his own personal desires." He must not only cease to plan out his life to his own wishes, but he must be ready at any moment to bear any privations and sufferings. One who seeks to arrange his bodily life to his own desires, will wreck the true life of fulfilment of the Father's will.

Most ruinous to the life of the Spirit is the love of gain, of getting rich. Men forget that, however much they acquire riches and goods, they may die at any moment, and their property is not an essential of life. Death broods over every one of us. Sickness, killing by men, fatal accidents, may at any minute end life. Bodily death is the unescapable condition of every second of life. While one lives, one must regard every hour of life as a delay granted by the kindness of some power. This we must remember, and not say that we do not know it. We know and foresee in regard to all events of earth and sky, but death, which we know waits on us every moment, we forget. But unless we forget death, we cannot yield ourselves to the life of the body, we cannot build upon it. To follow the teaching of Christ, one has to count up the advantages

of serving the bodily life, of serving one's own will, and the advantages of fulfilling the Father's will. Only one who clearly takes account of this can be a disciple of Christ. And he who makes the calculation, will not prefer a visionary benefit and a visionary life to the true good and the true life. The true life has been given to men, and men know it, they hear its summons, but, always swept on by the cares of the moment, they are withheld from it. The true life is as though a rich man gave a feast, and summoned the guests. His call to them is the voice of the Spirit of the Father inviting all men to Himself. But of those invited some are busy in commerce, some in the household, some in family affairs, — none come to the feast. Only the poor, such as have no cares of the body, come to the feast, and gain happiness. So men, distracting themselves with cares for the bodily life, are losing the true life. He who cannot, and that altogether, decline the cares and gains of the bodily life, cannot fulfil the Father's will, because one cannot serve oneself a little, and the Father a little.

A man must calculate, whether it is better to serve the body, whether it is possible to arrange his life according to his own will. He must do as one does who would build a house, or who contemplates war. Such an one will reckon whether he has means to finish building, whether he has means to conquer. And upon seeing that he has not, he will not spend for nothing either labor or armies. Otherwise, he fruitlessly wastes, and will be a laughingstock to men. If one could arrange the bodily life to one's own will, then it might be well to serve the body; but as that is impossible, then better sacrifice the body, and serve the Spirit. Otherwise, one will gain neither one thing nor another; the bodily life will not be gained, and the spiritual life will be lost. So that, to fulfil the Father's will, the bodily life must be quite resigned.

The bodily life is involved in the world's false riches, which we are commissioned to manage in such a way as to gain the true and perfect riches.

If a rich man has a manager who knows that, however he may serve his master, the latter will dismiss him, leaving him with nothing, this manager will do well if, during his management of the other's riches, he treats people well. Then, even though his master dismiss him, those whom he has benefited will receive him and sustain him. So also must men act as to the bodily life. The bodily life is that wealth, not one's own, which is given to one to manage for a time. If men will rightly use this wealth, which is not their own, then they will gain true wealth, really their own.

If we do not give up our falsely held riches, then the true life will not be given to us. The illusory life of the body, and the life of the spirit, cannot both be served. One cannot serve property and God. What is honorable with men, is abomination before God. Riches are evil before God. A rich man is continually guilty, in that he eats abundantly and luxuriously, while at his door the poor starve. And every one knows that the property which one will not share to others is held in non-fulfilment of the Father's will.

Once Jesus was approached by an orthodox and rich ruler, who began to boast that he had fulfilled all the commandments of the law. Jesus reminded him that there is a commandment to love others as oneself, and that this is the Father's will. The ruler said he kept this also. Then Jesus said to him: "That is not true; if you desire to fulfil the Father's will, you would not have property. A man cannot fulfil the will of the Father, if he has a fortune of his own, which he does not give away to others."

And Jesus said to the disciples: "Men think it impossible to live without property, but I tell you, true life is in the giving up of one's own to others."

A man, Zaccheus by name, heard the teaching of Jesus, and believed it, and having invited Jesus to his house, he said to him: "I am giving half my fortune to the poor, and I will restore four times over to those whom I may have wronged." And Jesus said: "Here is a man who fulfils the Father's will; for the fulfilment

of that will is not a matter of finding an opportunity, but the whole life must go in fulfilment."

Goodness cannot be measured in any way. It is impossible to say who has done more good, and who less. A widow who gives away her last farthing gives more than a rich man who gives thousands. It is also impossible to measure goodness by utility or inutility.

As an instance of how goodness must be shown, take the woman who pitied Jesus, and in her emotion poured upon him many pounds' worth of costly oil. Judas said she had done foolishly, because many people might have been fed on the price. But Judas was a thief; he spoke untruth, and in talking of the worldly value of the oil, he did not consider the poor. Not utility, not value, comes into the question, but the necessity of always, every minute, loving others, and giving up to them one's own.

CHAPTER VII

I AND THE FATHER ARE ONE

The true food of everlasting life is the fulfilment of the Father's will

(*"Give us our daily bread"*)

ANSWERING the Jews' demands for proofs of the truth of his teaching, Jesus said: "The truth of my teaching is proved in the fact that I teach, not in my own name, but in the name of the common Father of all men. I teach that which is good in the sight of the Father of all men, and is therefore good for all men.

"Do as I say; fulfil the five commandments, and you will see that the truth is as I say. Fulfilment of these five commandments will drive away all the world's evil; therefore it must be that they are true and right. Clearly, he who teaches, not his own personal will, but the will of Him who sent him, will teach the truth. The Mosaic law teaches the fulfilment of men's own wills, and is therefore full of contradictions; but my teaching is to

fulfil the will of the Father, and therefore in it all is harmonious."

The Jews did not understand him, and looked for external proofs as to whether he himself were the Christ written of in the prophecies. On this he said to them: "Do not inquire who I am, whether it is of me your prophecies speak, but attend to my teaching, to what I say of our common Father. It is not necessary to inquire about outside matters, as to whence I come; but my teaching must be followed. He who will follow my teaching will obtain true life. There can be no proofs of my teaching. It is the light itself, and as you cannot illuminate light, so you cannot prove the truth of truth. My teaching is light; he who sees it has light and life, and has no need of proofs. But he who is in darkness must come to the light."

But again the Jews asked him who he was, as to his bodily personality. He said to them: "I am, as I told you from the first, a man, the Son of the Father of life. Only he who will so regard himself (this is the truth I teach), and will fulfil the will of the common Father, only he will cease to be a slave, and become a free man. Because we are slaves only through the error which considers the bodily life as the real life. He who will understand the truth, that life consists only in the fulfilment of the Father's will, only he will become free and immortal. Just as a bond-servant in a master's house is not there for ever, but the son does remain, so the man who lives the life of a slave of the flesh does not remain in life for ever; but he who in spirit fulfils the Father's will, remains in life for ever. To understand me, you must understand that my Father is not that - which is your Father, what you call God. Your Father is a God of the flesh; but my Father is the Spirit of life. Your Father, your God, is a God of revenge, a murderer, one who executes men; but my Father gives life. Therefore we are children of different Fathers.

"I am following the truth, and you wish to kill me for that, to please your God. Your God is the devil, the source of evil; and in serving him, you serve the devil.

But my teaching is, that we are the sons of the Father of life, and that he who believes in my teaching shall not see death."

The Jews asked: "How can a man not die, when all the most God-pleasing men, even Abraham, are dead? How, then, can you say that you, and those that believe your teaching, will not die?" To this Jesus answered: "I speak not by my own authority. I speak of the one source of life, whom you call God, and who is in men. This source I know, I cannot help knowing, and I know His will, and I fulfil it; and of this source of life I say, that it was, and is, and shall be, being deathless."

The demand for proof of Jesus' teaching is like a demand made upon a once-blind man, to give proofs of how and why he sees light. The blind man whose sight was restored, still the same man he was before, can only say, he was blind, but now sees. Just this, and nothing else, can one answer who formerly did not understand the meaning of life, but now does understand. Such a man will say that he did not, before, know the true good in life, but now he knows. The once-blind man, when told he is cured not according to rule, and that he who cured him is the evil-doer, and that he must be cured in another way, can only reply, that he knows nothing as to the correctness of the manner of cure, or as to the faultiness of his healer, or as to their being a better way of cure, but that he knows only, he was blind, and now sees. And just so, he who grasps the meaning of this doctrine, that the true good is to fulfil the Father's will, can say nothing as to the regularity of the teaching, or as to the possibility of gaining something better. He will say: "Formerly I did not see the meaning of life; now I see. I know no more."

And Jesus said: "My teaching is the awakening of the life which has so far slept; he who will believe my teaching, shall awaken to eternal life, and continue to live after death. My teaching is not proved in any way, except that men give themselves up to it, because it alone has the promise of life for men.

"Sheep follow the shepherd, who gives them food and life; and in the same way, men accept my teaching because it gives life to all. And as the sheep do not follow the thief who climbs over into the fold, but throw themselves aside from him, so men, also, cannot accept the doctrines which teach violence and putting-to-death.

"My teaching is a door to the sheep, and all who will follow me shall find true life. As those only are good shepherds who own and like the sheep, and devote their lives to them, while the mere hirelings, who have no liking for sheep, are bad shepherds; so, also, only that teacher is true who does not look after himself, and he is bad who cares only about himself. My teaching is, that a man shall not look after himself, but shall yield up the life of the body for the life of the spirit. This I teach and fulfil."

Still the Jews did not understand, and persisted in looking for proofs as to whether or not Jesus was the Christ, to determine whether they should believe in him or not. They said: "Do not torment us, but tell us frankly, are you the Christ, or not?" Then Jesus answered them: "Belief must be given, not to words, but to deeds. By the deeds I teach you may know whether I teach truth or not. Do as I do, and do not trifle over words. Fulfil the will of the Father, and then you will all join with me and with the Father, because I am a Son of Man, and at one with the Father. And I am that which you call God, and I call Father. God and I are one. Even in your own writings it is said, that God said to men, 'You are gods.' Every one, by his spirit, is son of this Father. And if a man lives fulfilling the will of the Father, then he becomes at one with the Father. If I fulfil the will, the Father is in me, and I am in the Father."

After this, Jesus asked the disciples how they understood his teaching as to the Son of Man. Simon Peter answered him: "Your teaching is that you are the Son of the God of life; that God is the life of the spirit in man." And Jesus said to him: "Not only I am a son, but all men are; and this is revealed to men, not

by me, but by the common Father of men. Upon this knowledge is based the true life of man. To this life there is no death."

CHAPTER VIII

LIFE IS NOT TEMPORAL

Therefore true life is to be lived in the present

(*"This day"*)

DEALING with the disciples' question as to the recompense for surrendering the life of the body, Jesus said: "To him who enters into the reality of this teaching, no further recompense can be given; because, first, when a man yields up friends and goods for the sake of this teaching, he gains a hundred times more friends and goods; and second, a man who seeks such recompense wants to have something over and above others, which is entirely contrary to the fulfilment of the Father's will." In the Kingdom of Heaven there is neither great nor small; all are equal. Those who look for something extra as reward for their goodness, are like the laborers who claimed a greater payment than that for which they had agreed with their employer; merely because, in their opinion, they were more deserving than other laborers. There are no rewards, punishments, degradations, or exaltations, for him who understands this teaching. No one can be higher or lower, more or less important, than another, according to the teaching of Jesus.

All can equally fulfil the Father's will. Therefore, in so doing, no one becomes superior, truer, or better, than another.

Kings and those who serve them, they only are measured by such standards. By my teaching, said Jesus, there can be no superior rank, because he who would excel must serve everybody; for the teaching is, that life is given to man, not that others may serve him,

but that he may give his whole life to serve others ; but he who will not do this, but seeks to exalt himself, shall fall lower than he was.

To get rid of all ideas of rewards and of one's elevation, the meaning, purpose, of life must be understood. That lies in fulfilling the will of the Father ; and the will of the Father is, that that which He gave shall be returned to Him. As a shepherd leaves his flock, and goes to look for the lost sheep, as a woman will search everywhere to find a lost penny, so also the Father's continual work is manifested to us in His drawing to Himself that which pertains to Him.

We must understand the true life, what it is. The true life is brought to light always in the lost being brought back to where they belong, in the awakening of those who slept. People who have the true life, who are restored to the source of their being, cannot, like worldly men, take account of others as better or worse ; but, being sharers of the Father's life, they can take delight only in the return of the lost to their Father. If a son, who has gone astray and left his father, should repent, and return, how then could the other sons of the same father grudge at the father's joy, or themselves not rejoice at the brother's return ?

To lead us to believe the teaching, and to alter one's way of living, and fulfil the teaching, we need, not external proofs, not promises of reward, but a clear understanding of what the true life is. If men think they are complete masters of their own lives, and that life is given them for bodily enjoyment, then clearly, any sacrifice made for another will seem to them an act worthy of reward, and without such payment they will yield nothing. A man demands rents from tenants who have forgotten that their ground is theirs on condition that they give up the fruits to the owner ; and when he demands the rent again and again, they seek to kill him. So with the men who think themselves masters of their own lives, not discerning that life is given by true understanding ; men who demand the fulfilment of their own wills.

Both belief and action are necessary, to learn that a man can do nothing of himself, and if he give up his bodily life to serve goodness, he deserves neither thanks nor reward. We must understand that, in doing good, a man only does his duty, does what he must necessarily do. Only by so understanding his life, can a man have faith to enable him to do deeds of true goodness.

Precisely in such an understanding of life, the Kingdom of Heaven consists. This Kingdom is invisible ; it cannot be pointed out as identified with this or that place. The Kingdom of Heaven is in the human understanding. The whole society of the world goes on living as of old ; men eat, drink, marry, trade, die, and along with this, in the souls of men, lives the Kingdom of Heaven. It is the understanding of life, growing from itself, like a tree in the spring.

The true life of the fulfilment of the Father's will is not in the life of the past, or of the future, but it is the life of now, the life which all must live at this instant of time. Therefore one must never relax the true life in them. Men are set to watch over life, not of the past or the future, but the life now being lived ; and in that, to fulfil the will of the Father of all men. If they let this life escape them, by not fulfilling the Father's will, then they will not receive it back again ; just as a watchman, set upon a night-long watch, does not perform his duty if he fall asleep even for a moment ; for in this moment a thief may come.

Therefore a man must concentrate his strength in the present hour, for in this hour only can he fulfil the Father's will. And that will is life and blessing for all men. Only those live who are doing good. Good done to men, now, in this hour, is life, life which unites us with the common Father.

CHAPTER IX

TEMPTATIONS

The illusions of temporal life conceal from men the true life in the present

("Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors")

MAN is born with knowledge of the true life of fulfilment of the Father's will. Children live by that knowledge; through them we may see what the Father's will is. To understand the teaching of Jesus, one must understand the life of children, and be like them.

Children always live in the Father's will, not breaking the five commandments. They would not come to break them if their elders did not mislead them. In misleading children to break those commandments, men ruin the children. In misleading them, men are doing as they would do by fastening a millstone to a man's neck and throwing him into the water.

If there were no temptations, the world would be happy. The world is unhappy by them only. These temptations are wrong-doing which men enact for imaginary gain to the life in time. Temptations ruin men; therefore it is necessary to give up everything rather than fall into temptation.

Temptation against the first commandment leads men to consider themselves in the right against others, and others as in the wrong, debtors to them. To avoid this temptation, men must remember that all men are always infinitely in debt to the Father, and they can only clear themselves of this debt by forgiving their brother-men.

Therefore men must overlook injuries, and not be deterred though the offender again and again injure them. However many times a man may be injured, he must forgive, and still forgive, not remembering the wrong. For the Kingdom of Heaven is forgiveness.

If we do not forgive, we are doing as the debtor did. This debtor, greatly owing, came to him in whose power he was, and began to ask for mercy. The other forgave

him all. The debtor went away, and began himself to squeeze a debtor, who owed him but a little. Now, to gain life, we must fulfil the Father's will. And we pray the Father to forgive us, that we have not duly fulfilled his will, and we hope to be forgiven. What, then, are we doing, if we do not ourselves forgive? We are doing to others what we dread for ourselves.

The will of the Father is well-being, and evil is that which separates us from the Father. Why, then, should we not strive to quench evil right away, when evil ruins us, and takes our life?

Temptation against the second commandment is, to think that woman is created for bodily pleasure, and that in leaving one woman and taking another, heightened pleasure is gained. To avoid this temptation, we must remember that the Father's will is, not that man should amuse himself with woman's charms, but that every man, with his wife, should be one body. The Father's will is, for every man, one wife; for every wife, one husband. If one man keep to one wife, then there is wife or husband for each one who needs. Therefore he who changes the woman he lives with deprives her of a husband, and tempts some other man to leave his wife and take the deserted one. A man may do without a wife, but he must not have more than one, because if he does, he goes against the will of the Father, which is, that one man unite with one woman.

Temptation against the third commandment is, for men to create, for the protection of the temporal life, authoritative powers, and to demand from each other oaths, pledges, to do the deeds those powers demand.

To avoid this temptation, men must remember that they are not indebted for their life to any power but God. The claims of authority must be regarded as violence; and, following the commandment regarding the non-resistance of evil, men must yield what the authorities demand, namely, their goods and labor; but they cannot, either by oaths or promises, pledge their conduct. Oaths, being imposed, make men bad. He who recognizes life in the will of the Father cannot bind his

actions by pledges; because for such a man there is nothing more sacred than his own life.

Temptation against the fourth commandment is, for men to hold that, by giving themselves up to animosity and revenge, they can exterminate evil from among themselves. If a man injure another, men think he should be punished, and that justice lies in human judgments. To be free from this temptation, we must remember that men are called, not to judge, but to save each other. To judge of another's injustice is impossible for men, as they themselves are full of wickedness. The only thing open to them is to teach others by example of goodness, forgiveness, and purity.

Temptation against the fifth commandment is, for man to think there is a difference between one's own countrymen and men of other nations; and that it is therefore necessary to make defense against other nations, and to injure them. To avoid this temptation, it is necessary to know that all the commandments are summed up in this one, of fulfilling the will of the Father who gives life and well-being to all men; and therefore it is necessary to do good to all men, without distinction. Even though others still make such distinctions, and though nations who look on each other as aliens are at war, nevertheless, everybody who would fulfil the Father's will must do good to all men, even to those who belong to another nation which is at war.

To avoid falling into any delusions of men, we must not think about bodily affairs, but about spiritual. To him who has understood that life consists in being, at this moment, in the Father's will, neither deprivations, nor suffering, nor death can be dreadful. Only he obtains true life who is, at every moment, ready to give up his bodily life in order to fulfil the Father's will.

And that all may understand the true life to be one in which there is no death, Jesus said: "Eternal life must not be understood to be like this present life. For the true life in the Father's will, there is neither space nor time. Those who are awakened to the true life, live in the will of the Father, for which there is no space nor

time ; and they live with the Father. Though they die to us, they live to God. Therefore one commandment includes in itself all others ; the commandment, namely, to love, with all our strength, the source of life ; and consequently to love all men, each of whom bears in himself this same original."

And Jesus said : "This source of life is that very Christ which you await. The comprehension of this source of life, which knows no distinction of persons, no time, no place, is the Son of Man which I teach. Anything which hides this source of life from men is temptation. There is the temptation of the scribes, bookmen, and of the materialists ; do not yield thereto. There are the temptations of authority ; do not yield thereto. And there is the most terrible temptation, from the teachers of religion who call themselves orthodox. Beware of this last more than of all others ; because just they, these self-ordained teachers, by inventing the worship of a false God, decoy you from the true God. They, instead of serving the Father of life by deeds, substitute words, and they teach words, while they themselves do nothing. Therefore you can learn nothing from them but words. But the Father requires deeds, not words. And they have nothing to teach, because they themselves know nothing ; but for their own gain they must parade as teachers. But you know that no man can be the teacher of another. There is one teacher for all — the Lord of life — understanding. And these self-assuming teachers, thinking to teach others, deprive themselves of true life, and prevent others from the understanding of it. They teach that their God will be pleased with external ceremonies ; and they think they can bring men to serve religion by vows. They are concerned with appearances only. An outward assumption of religion suffices them, but they do not care what is in the hearts of men. Therefore they are like elaborate coffins, very nice outside, but within full of repulsiveness. They give honor, in words, to saints and martyrs, but they are themselves just the very men who have murdered and tortured in the past, and who murder and tor-

ture the saints of to-day. By them come all the world's temptations; because, under the guise of good, they teach evil. The temptation they create is the root of all others, because they defile that which is most sacred. For a long time yet they will not be changed, but will continue their deceptions, and increase evil in the world. But there shall come a time when all the temples will be ruined, with all the external God-worship; when all men will understand, and unite in love, to serve the one Father of life, by fulfilling His will."

CHAPTER X

THE WARFARE WITH TEMPTATION

Therefore, not to fall by temptation, we must, at every moment of life, be at one with the Father

("Lead us not into temptation")

THE Jews saw that the teaching of Jesus would destroy their state, religion, and nationality, and at the same time they saw they could not controvert him; so they decided to kill him. His innocence and justness stood in their way, but the high priest Caiaphas discovered a reason for killing Jesus, though innocent. Caiaphas said: "We need not consider whether this man is just or unjust; we have to determine whether our Jewish people shall remain a separate nation, or whether we shall be broken up and dispersed: the nation will perish, and the people be scattered, if we leave this man alone, and do not put him to death." This argument settled the matter, and the orthodox sentenced Jesus to death. They instructed the people to seize upon him as soon as he might appear in Jerusalem.

Jesus, although he knew about this, nevertheless, on the feast of the Passover, came to Jerusalem. His disciples entreated him not to do so; but he said: "What these orthodox can do to me, and all that other men can do, cannot alter the truth for me. If I have the light, I know where I am, and which way I am going. Only

he who does not know the truth can fear anything, or can doubt anything. Only he who cannot see, stumbles." And he went to Jerusalem, stopping on the way at Bethany.

When he left Bethany, and went to Jerusalem, crowds of people met and followed him. This still more convinced the orthodox of the need to kill him. They only wanted an opportunity to seize him. He knew also that the lightest incautious word from him at that time, spoken against the law, would be a reason for his execution; but notwithstanding this, he entered the temple, and declared again that the worship of the Jews, with their sacrifices and libations, was false, and he declared his teaching. But his teaching, based on the prophets, was such that the orthodox could not yet find a palpable breach of the law which would justify them in putting him to death; the more so that the greater part of the lower class was with Jesus.

At the feast were certain heathen, who, having heard of the teaching of Jesus, wished to talk with him about it. The disciples, hearing of this, were afraid, fearing lest Jesus, in talking with them, should betray himself, and excite the people. At first they would not bring Jesus and these heathen together; but afterward they resolved to tell him these men wanted to see him. Hearing this, Jesus was disturbed. He well knew that his speech to the heathen would clearly show his antagonism to the whole Jewish law, would turn the crowd from him, and would give the orthodox a reason to accuse him of being in league with the hated heathen. Jesus became disturbed, knowing this; but he also knew that his mission was to make clear to men, the children of one Father, their real unity, despite differences of religion. He knew that the step he was about to take would end his bodily life, for the sake of giving birth to spiritual results. He said: "He who holds fast to the bodily life is deprived of the true one; and he who is not careful for the bodily life obtains the true life. I am troubled by what is before me, but I have only lived that I might reach this hour; how, then, can I fail to

now do what I must do? So let the Father's will be shown through me now."

And turning to the people, heathen and Jews, Jesus declared openly what he had only privately told to Nicodemus. He said: "Men's lives, with all their various religions and organized powers, must be wholly changed. All power and authority must disappear. It is only necessary to understand the nature of man as the son of the Father of life, and this understanding abolishes all division among men, and all ruling power, and makes men one."

The Jews said: "You wholly destroy our religion. Our law looks to the Christ, but you speak only of the Son of Man, and say that he must be set up. What do you mean?" He answered them: "To set up the Son of Man means to live by the light of the understanding which is in men, to follow this light into more light. I teach no new faith, only that which every one may know within himself. Every man knows he has life, given to him and to all men by the Father of life. My teaching is only this, that man must live the life given by the Father to all."

Many of the humbler kind of people believed Jesus. But the notable and official classes disbelieved; because they did not want to consider the universal basis of what he said, but only its immediate and temporary bearings. They saw that he turned the people from themselves, and they wished to kill him; but they were afraid to seize him openly, and did not seek to do so in Jerusalem and in the daytime, but secretly elsewhere.

And one of the twelve disciples, Judas Iscariot, approached the authorities, and him they bribed to take their emissaries to Jesus when he should be away from the people. Judas promised this, and went again to Jesus, awaiting a suitable opportunity to betray him.

On the first day of the feast, Jesus and his disciples kept the Passover. And Judas, thinking Jesus was not aware of his treachery, was with them. But Jesus knew Judas had sold him. And as they all sat at table, Jesus took bread, broke it in twelve pieces, and gave a

piece to each disciple, including Judas with the rest. And not mentioning any name, he said: "Take, eat my body." Then he took the cup with the wine, passed it to them, for them all, including Judas, to drink from, and said: "One of you will shed my blood. Drink my blood."

Afterward Jesus got up, and began to wash the feet of all his disciples, including Judas. And having finished, he said: "I know that one of you will betray me to my death, and shed my blood; but him I have fed, and given to drink, and washed his feet. I have done this to show you how you must act toward those who do you harm. If you will act in this way, you shall be blest." And the disciples went on to ask who the betrayer was. But Jesus did not give his name, so that they might not turn on him. And when it had grown dark, Jesus showed that it was Judas, and at the same time told him to go away. Judas got up from the table and went off, no one hindering him.

Then Jesus said: "This is the meaning of setting up the Son of Man. To set up the Son of Man is to be like the Father, good; and that, not only to those who love us, but to all men, even to those who do us harm. And therefore do not argue over my teaching, do not pick it to pieces as the orthodox did, but do as I have done; do as I have done under your eyes. This one commandment I give you: Love men. My whole teaching is, to love men always, and to the last."

After this, fear came over Jesus, and he went in the dark with his disciples to a garden, to be out of the way. While walking, he said to them: "You are all wavering and timid; if they move to take me, you will all run away." To this, Peter said: "No, I will never leave you; I will defend you even to death." And all the disciples said so. Then Jesus said: "If that be the case, then get ready for defense; take provision, because we must hide, take weapons, to fight for ourselves." The disciples said they had two swords.

When Jesus heard this about the swords, anguish came over him. And going to a vacant place, he be-

gan to pray, and entreated his disciples to do the same. But the disciples did not understand his state of mind. Jesus said: "My Father, the Spirit, end in me this struggle with temptation. Strengthen me to the fulfilment of Thy will. I do not want my own way. I do not want to defend my bodily life. I want to do Thy will, in not resisting evil."

The disciples still did not understand. And he said to them: "Do not consider the concerns of the body, but try to rise into the spirit; strength is in the spirit, but the flesh is powerless." And a second time he said: "My Father, if suffering must be, then let it come. But even in suffering, I want one thing only: that not my will shall be fulfilled, but thine." The disciples did not understand. And again he struggled with the temptation; and at last conquered it. Coming to the disciples, he said: "It is settled now; you can be at rest. I shall not fight, but shall surrender myself into the hands of the men of this world."

CHAPTER XI

THE FAREWELL DISCOURSE

The self-life is an illusion which comes through the flesh, an evil. The true life is the life common to all men

("Deliver us from evil")

JESUS, finding himself prepared for death, went to give himself up. Peter stopped him, and asked: "Where are you going?" Jesus answered: "I am going where you cannot go. I am ready for death, and you are not yet ready." Peter said: "No, I am even now ready to sacrifice my life for thee." Jesus said to him: "A man cannot promise anything."

And he said to all his disciples: "I know death is before me, but I believe in the life of the Father, and therefore am not afraid of it. Do not be distressed over

my death, but believe in the real God, in the Father of life, and then my death will not seem dreadful to you. If I am united with the Father of life, then I cannot be deprived of life. It is true, I do not tell you what and where my life will be, after death, but I point out to you the way to true life. My teaching does not reveal what that life is to be, but it reveals the only true way of life. That is, to be in unity with the Father. The Father is the source of life. My teaching is, that man shall live in the will of the Father, and fulfil His will for the life and well-being of all men.

“Your teacher, when I am gone, will be your knowledge of the truth. In fulfilling my teaching, you will always feel that you are in the truth, that the Father is in you, and you are in the Father. And knowing in yourselves the Father of life, you will experience a peace of which nothing will deprive you. And therefore, if you know the truth and live in it, neither my death nor your own can trouble you.

“Men think of themselves as separate beings, each with his own power of will in life; but this is only an illusion. The only true life is that which recognizes the Father’s will as the source of life. My teaching reveals this oneness of life, and represents life, not as separate shoots, but as one tree, on which all the shoots grow. Only he who lives in the Father’s will, like a shoot of a tree, only he lives; and he who wishes to live by his own will, dies away like a torn-off shoot.

“The Father gave me life to do good, and I have taught you to live to do good. If you will fulfil my commandment, you will be blessed. The commandment which sums up my whole teaching is no more than this, that all men shall love one another. And love is to sacrifice one’s own bodily life for another’s sake. Love has no other definition. In fulfilling my commandment of love, you will not fulfil it like slaves, who follow the orders of a master without understanding them; but you will live as free men, as I am, because I have made clear to you the purpose of life, which follows from the knowledge of the Father of life. You have adopted my teach-

ing, not from accidental choice, but because it is the only truth by which men are made free.

“The teaching of the world is to do evil to men ; but I teach that men love each other. Therefore the world will despise you, as it has despised me. The world does not understand my teaching, and therefore will persecute you, and do you evil, thinking thereby to serve God. Do not be astonished at this ; you must understand that it is necessarily so. The world, not understanding the true God, must persecute you ; but you must affirm the truth.

“You grieve because they will kill me ; but they kill me for declaring the truth. And therefore my death is necessary for the declaration of the truth. My death, in facing which I do not go back from the truth, will strengthen you, and you will understand the nature of untruth and of truth. You will understand that untruth lies in men’s belief in the bodily life, and their disbelief in the life of the spirit ; that truth consists in unity with the Father, from which results the victory of the spirit over the flesh.

“Even when I shall not be with you in the bodily life, my spirit will be with you. But you, like all men, will not always feel within you the power of the spirit. Sometimes you will relax and lose strength of spirit ; and you will fall into temptation ; and at times you will again awaken to the true life. Hours of bondage to the body will come upon you, but for a time only ; you will suffer, and again be restored to the spirit, like a woman who suffers birth-pangs, and then has joy because she has brought a human being into the world. So will your experience be, when, after falling under the power of the body, you rise again by the spirit. You will then feel such joy, that nothing will be left for you to desire. Know this, then, beforehand ; and in spite of persecution, in spite of internal struggle and casting down of spirit, know that the spirit lives in you, and that the only true God is the knowledge of the Father’s will, as I have revealed it.”

And addressing the Father, the Spirit, Jesus said:

"I have done that which Thou hast commanded me; I have revealed to men that Thou art the source of everything. And they have understood me. I have taught them that they all come from the source of infinite life, and therefore they are all one; and that as the Father is in me, and I am in the Father, so they, too, are one with me and the Father. I have revealed to them also, that, like Thee, who in love hast sent them into the world, they, too, shall with love live in the world."

CHAPTER XII

THE VICTORY OF THE SPIRIT OVER THE FLESH

Therefore, for him who lives, not the self-life, but a common life in the will of the Father, there is no death. Bodily death is for him union with the Father

("Thine is the kingdom, power, and glory")

WHEN Jesus had ended his discourse to the disciples, he rose, and, instead of running away or defending himself, he went on the way to meet Judas, who was bringing soldiers to take him. Jesus came to Judas, and asked him why he had come. But Judas did not answer, and a crowd of soldiers came round Jesus. Peter threw himself forward to defend his teacher, and, drawing his sword, began to fight. But Jesus stopped him, and said to him, that he who fights with a sword must himself perish with the sword, and ordered him to put up the sword. Then Jesus said to those who had come to take him: "I have up to now gone about among you alone, without fear, and I do not fear now. Do as you choose."

And while all the disciples ran away, Jesus was left alone. The officer of the soldiers ordered Jesus to be bound, and led before Annas. This Annas was a former high priest, and lived in the same house with Caiaphas, who was then high priest. Caiaphas it was who provided the reason upon which they decided to

kill Jesus ; namely, that if he were not killed the nation would disappear.

Jesus, feeling himself to be in the will of the Father, was ready for death, and did not resist when they took him, and was not afraid when they led him away. But the very Peter who had just promised Jesus that he would not renounce him, but would die for him, this same Peter who wished to protect him,—now, when he saw that they were taking Jesus for execution, and being met with the door-keeper's question, Whether he was not with Jesus? gave up, and deserted him. It was only afterward that, hearing the cock crow, Peter brought to mind all that Jesus had said. Then he understood that there are two temptations of the flesh, fear and fighting ; and that it was with these that Jesus struggled when he prayed in the garden, and asked the disciples to pray. And now he, Peter, had fallen before both these temptations of the flesh, of which Jesus had forewarned him ; he had wished to fight against evil, and to defend the truth, he had been about to strike and to do evil himself ; and now he could not endure the fear of bodily suffering, and had renounced his teacher. Jesus had yielded neither to the temptation to fight, when the disciples got ready two swords for his defense, nor to the temptation to fear before the men of Jerusalem, first, in the case of the heathen, and now before the soldiers, who had bound him and led him to trial.

Jesus was taken before Caiaphas. Caiaphas began to question him about his teaching. But knowing that Caiaphas was examining him, not to find out what his teaching was, but only to convict him, Jesus did not answer, but said : “ I have concealed nothing, and now conceal nothing. If you wish to know what my teaching is, ask those who heard and understood it.” For saying this, the high priest's servant struck Jesus in the face, and Jesus asked him why he so beat him. But the man did not answer him, and the high priest continued the trial. Witnesses were brought, who deposed that Jesus had boasted that he made an end of the Jewish religion. And the high priest interrogated Jesus ; who,

seeing they did not examine him to learn anything, but only to make a show of a judicial trial, answered nothing.

Then a priest asked him : "Tell me, are you the Christ, the Son of God?" Jesus said : "Yes, I am the Christ, the Son of God; and now, in torturing me, you will see how a Son of Man is like to God." And the priest was glad to hear these words, and said to the other judges : "Are not these words enough to condemn him?" And the judges said : "That is enough; we sentence him to death." And when they said that, the people threw themselves upon Jesus, and began to beat him, to spit in his face, and insult him. He was silent.

The Jews had no power to punish men with death, and for that needed permission from the Roman governor. Therefore, having condemned Jesus in their court, and having subjected him to ignominy, they took him to the Roman governor, Pilate, that he might execute him. Pilate asked why they wished to kill Jesus. They said, because he was a criminal. Pilate said that if he was so, they must judge him by their own law. They said : "We want you to put him to death, because he is guilty before the Roman Cæsar; he is a rebel, he agitates the people, he forbids payment of taxes to Cæsar, and calls himself the Jewish king."

Pilate summoned Jesus before him, and said : "What is the meaning of this; are you the Jewish king?"

Jesus said : "Do you really wish to know what my kingdom means, or are you only asking for form's sake?"

Pilate answered : "I am not a Jew, and it is the same to me whether you are the Jewish king or not; but I ask you, who are you, and why do they call you king?"

Jesus said : "They say truly, that I call myself a king. I am indeed a king, but my kingdom is not of earth, but of heaven. The kings of the earth war and fight, and have armies; but as for me,—you see they have bound and beaten me, and I did not resist. I am king from heaven: my power is of the spirit."

Pilate said : "Then it is indeed true that you think yourself a king?"

Jesus answered: "You know this yourself. Every one who lives by the spirit is free. I live by this only, and I only teach by showing men the truth, that they are free by the spirit."

Pilate said: "You teach the truth, but nobody knows what truth is, and every one has his own truth."

And having said this, he turned his back on Jesus, and went again to the Jews. Coming out to them, he said: "I find nothing criminal in this man. Why, then, put him to death?"

The priests answered: "He ought to be put to death, because he incites the people."

Then Pilate began to examine Jesus before the priests; but Jesus, seeing it was only a mock inquiry, answered nothing. Then Pilate said: "I alone cannot condemn him; take him to Herod."

At Herod's tribunal, Jesus again answered nothing to the accusations of the priests; and Herod, thinking Jesus to be a common fellow, ordered him, for mockery, to be dressed in red clothes, and sent back to Pilate.

Pilate pitied Jesus, and began to entreat the priests to forgive him, if only on account of the feast. But the priests did not consent, and all—the people with them—cried out to crucify Christ. Pilate tried a second time to persuade them to let Jesus go; but priests and people cried out that he must be executed. They said: "He is guilty of calling himself the Son of God." Pilate again summoned Jesus, and asked him what he meant by calling himself the Son of God. Jesus answered nothing.

Then Pilate said: "Why do you not answer me, seeing that I have power to execute you or to set you free?"

Jesus answered: "You have no authority over me; authority only comes from on high."


And Pilate a third time began to persuade the Jews to set Jesus free. But they said to him: "If you will not execute this man, whom we have exposed as an enemy to Cæsar, then you yourself are not a friend, but an enemy, to Cæsar."

And hearing these words, Pilate gave way, and or-

dered the execution of Jesus. They first stripped him and flogged him; then they dressed him again in a ridiculous way. And they beat him, mocked him, and insulted him. Then they caused him to carry the cross, and led him to the place of execution, where they crucified him.

And as Jesus hung on the cross, the whole populace mocked him. But to this mockery Jesus answered: "Father! do not call them to account; they do not know what they are doing." And then, as he was now drawing near death, he said: "Father! I yield my spirit into Thy care."

And bowing his head, he breathed his last.



COUNT L. N. TOLSTOÏ.

From the portrait by Ilya Y. Repin, 1887.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

LIFE

COPYRIGHT, 1899,
By THOMAS Y. CROWELL & CO.

PREFACE TO "WHAT IS TO BE DONE?"

THE misery and sufferings of the very poor, in the so-called "slums," have a family resemblance in all the great cities of the world. The special feature which characterizes the old capital of Russia over and above the general features of that problem in our great American cities, or in London for example, is, that the poor are, almost exclusively, Russians, instead of a conglomeration of foreigners whom the law, ill-calculated ambition, or the spirit of restlessness, have driven out of their native lands.

These poor Russians, of whom the great Russian novelist and philanthropist writes in the pages of "What is to be Done?" are, in a great measure, the victims of the Emancipation of the Serfs. The Emancipation was, beyond question, not only righteous and beneficent, but a profoundly wise administrative measure. Nevertheless, the conditions were such that the owners of estates have suffered severely, though cheerfully, in company with their former serfs, in consequence of that measure. Some of the problems on the parts of both masters and serfs have gradually solved themselves, to a greater or less degree, in the generation which has elapsed since the Emancipation. Other problems have only become more complicated—notably the one herein dealt with. The peasant is still bound to the soil by the very real fetter of taxes for the current expenses of government; and, in many cases also, for the instalments of payment for the land which he received with his freedom. This communal burden he can neither escape nor evade; yet, at the same time, the allotments of communal land grow constantly smaller through periodical subdivision to

comply with the rights of the rapidly increasing population. Thus the peasant's dues often increase, while his means of meeting them decrease through no fault of his or of the authorities. The efforts of the government to extend educational facilities, and the earnest desire of the peasants themselves for more and higher education, impose still further burdens. In order to meet all these obligations, the peasants with insufficient land swarm to the capitals and join the already congested ranks of the landless peasants, handicraftsmen, and others in search of work.

Moscow probably receives a larger number of such involuntary wanderers than St. Petersburg, simply because it is nearer the agricultural region than the latter. Therefore the picture which Count Tolstoy presents may be regarded as setting forth the Russian situation at its very worst. There are, it is true, many factories in and around Moscow, and in a multitude of other places in the empire. But they are far from sufficient in number to meet the exigencies of the case. Indeed, in what country do they meet the exigencies of the case? Emigration to the rich mining regions of Siberia will do much to relieve the peasants, but, even there, there have arisen fresh problems; and, even now, with the railway and vastly increased facilities of every description, Siberia is not the place for penniless immigrants, because of natural difficulties connected with distances, and the primary requisites of wood, water, and the like.

At the time when this book was written (1886) even this outlet did not exist in such a degree as to justify its being taken into consideration; and for other reasons there can hardly be much change in the Moscow slums for many a day to come.

One must have seen and talked with the poor of Moscow in order fully to realize the pictures which wrung Count Tolstoy's heart, and which he offers to us as the Russian contribution to the World's Exposition of Wretchedness. Wealthy Russians of all classes are pitiful and extremely generous with their money for all good works. They are equally generous with their per-

sonal labors. It is the custom for wealthy merchants (who, more than the nobility, keep up certain ancient traditions) to bequeath large sums to free soup-kitchens and night lodging-houses. The recipient of the bounty murmurs a prayer for the soul of his benefactor as he eats the generous portion of savory cabbage-soup and hulled boiled buckwheat (*kasha*), and sour, black rye bread, which is provided. That is one form of relief — only temporary of course; and also, of course, in Russia, as elsewhere, there are people who prefer a wretched, precarious existence to systematic labor.

One of the many more vigorous and extensive efforts to cope with the misery of Moscow, which I might cite, is a free, permanent lodging-house for widows and their children, with the most approved and modern arrangements for cooking and washing enjoyed in common by all the inhabitants. There is even a private church, with its priest, in the house. This princely gift to his town by a Moscow merchant-prince is only one of many noble deeds of men who do their good deeds with absolute modesty. But the problem of misery still remains unsolved, except in tiny oases.

The history of this present translation is interesting. The publication of Count Tolstoy's Manuscript in its entirety was not permitted in Russia. A firm in Switzerland, which makes a business of printing forbidden books and pamphlets, issued the first half, and I made my translation from that Swiss pamphlet. After long and vain endeavors to obtain the second half from the same source, I was briefly informed, without explanations, that the firm had decided not to publish it. I then had recourse to the Russian edition, authorized by the censor, for the second half. In that edition the censor's omissions of words, phrases, and entire paragraphs, were sometimes indicated thus: . . . Sometimes (as I found by comparison) no indication was given. The original publication in English, therefore (1887), consisted of a perfect first half and of a mangled second half, as I explained in a foot-note.

Shortly after my arrival in St. Petersburg, in the

autumn of 1887, one friend of Count Tolstoy offered me, on the author's behalf, the unabridged Manuscript; another friend offered me the present complete translation, and it seemed wiser to substitute it in the Complete Works of Count Tolstoy, for the imperfect version. I was requested to correct and rewrite certain parts (*i.e.* make a new translation of them), which I did. Perhaps the most curious and interesting point connected with the affair is the explanation which was given to me of the Swiss firm's real reason for not publishing Part II. That firm is revolutionary, anarchistic in politics, and it published Part I. because it regarded the sentiments therein contained as suited to the aims of that faction. (This judgment evidently coincides with the judgment of the Russian censor!) But Part II. would not have made a good "campaign document," so it was practically suppressed, exactly as the censor would have suppressed undesirable matter. Of a truth, extremes do meet! It is difficult for an outsider, an impartial judge, to perceive in what particular this procedure on the part of the revolutionists differs from the procedure of the censor's office to which they so strongly object, unless it be that the revolutionists are more sweeping in their condemnations, that they "out-Herod Herod," to use a phrase which ought to meet even their views of the case.

It may add to the reader's interest if he will try to read the last half, with one eye on the censor and one on the revolutionists, after the good old Russian fashion mentioned in the "Byliny" (Epic Songs) as the peculiarity of Nightingale the Robber, who kept "one eye on Kieff, one on Tchernigoff."

ISABEL F. HAPGOOD.

CONTENTS

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?		pp. 1-283
LIFE		pp. 285-441
CHAPTER		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION	287
I.	The Fundamental Contradiction of Human Life	300
II.	The Sole Aim of Life	303
III.	The Error of the Scribes	307
IV.	The Teaching of the Scribes, under the Conception of the Whole Life of Man, presents the Visible Phenomena of his Animal Existence, and from them draws Deductions as to the Aim of his Life	309
V.	The False Doctrines of the Scribes and Pharisees give neither Explanations of the Meaning of Real Life, nor Guidance therein; the Inertia of Life, which has no Rational Explanation, appears as the Sole Guide of Life	312
VI.	Division of Consciousness in the Men of our World	318
VII.	The Partition of Consciousness arises from the Blending of the Life of the Animal with the Life of Man	321
VIII.	There is no Division and Contradiction; it only so appears through False Doctrine	324
IX.	The Birth of True Life in Man	326
X.	Reason is that Law acknowledged by Man according to which his Life must be accomplished	328
XI.	The False Direction of Learning	330
XII.	The Cause of False Knowledge is the False Perspective in which Objects present themselves	335

CHAPTER	PAGE
XIII. The Recognizability of Objects is augmented, not because of their Manifestation in Space and Time, but because of the Unity of the Law whereto we and those Subjects which we study are Subservient	339
XIV. The True Life of Man is not that which takes place in Space and Time	343
XV. The Renunciation of Happiness of the Animal Personality is the Law of Man's Life	347
XVI. The Animal Personality is the Instrument of Life	350
XVII. Birth in the Spirit	353
XVIII. The Demands of Rational Consciousness	354
XIX. The Demand of the Individuality appears Incompatible with the Demand of Rational Consciousness	361
XX. What is required is, not Renunciation of Individuality, but its Subjection to Rational Consciousness	364
XXI. The Feeling of Love is a Phenomenon of the Individual Activity brought into Subjection to Rational Consciousness	369
XXII. The Manifestation of the Feeling of Love is Impossible for Men who do not understand the Meaning of their Life	372
XXIII. True Love is the Result of the Renunciation of the Happiness of the Personality	379
XXIV. Love is Love only when it is the Sacrifice of Self	383
XXV. Men's Efforts, directed to the Impossible Amelioration of their Existence, deprive them of the Possibility of the One True Life	386
XXVI. The Fear of Death is only a Confession of the Unsolved Contradiction of Life	389
XXVII. The Death of the Flesh annihilates the Body which belongs to Space and the Consciousness which belongs to Time, but it cannot annihilate that which constitutes the Foundation of Life: the Special Relation of every Creature to the World	394

CONTENTS

xi

CHAPTER	PAGE
XXVIII. The Fear of Death arises from the Fact that Men accept as Life one Small Portion of it limited by their Own False Idea	400
XXIX. Life is a Relation to the World. The Movement of Life is the Establishment of a New, a Higher, Relation, and therefore Death is the Entrance upon a New Relation	403
XXX. The Life of Dead Men is not ended in this World . . .	406
XXXI. The Superstition of Death arises from this, that Man confounds his Different Relations to the World . . .	412
XXXII. The Visible Life is a Part of the Endless Movement of Life	416
XXXIII. The Inexplicability of the Sufferings of the Earthly Exis- tence proves to Man more convincingly than anything else that his Life is not a Life of Personality, which began at his Birth and which ends at his Death . . .	421
XXXIV. Bodily Sufferings constitute an Indispensable Condition of the Life and Happiness of Men	430
CONCLUSION	435
APPENDIX I	435
APPENDIX II	438
APPENDIX III	440

INTRODUCTION

THE problem of life, as elucidated by Count Tolstoï, is one of very simple principles. As Christ in the New Testament story advised the rich young man to sell all he had, distribute his great possessions among the poor, and follow him, if he would enter into the kingdom of heaven, so this modern prophet would advise the rich young men of our day to cease living a parasitic life, to cease chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of pleasure, to earn their daily bread in the sweat of their faces, to follow strictly the precepts of Jesus, not as interpreted by a selfish, luxurious, and decadent Church, but by the light of experience. If the so-called Christians of all denominations and sects would really take Christ as their master and guide, poverty would cease, the dangers of too great private magnificence and pride, such as wrecked the Roman Empire, would be obviated, courts and litigation, wars and the need of the enormous armies which now sap the vitality of the nations, would be done away with; the exclusive and meretricious art, which now foment the passions, would be replaced by simpler and more genuine music, poetry, painting, and drama, such as the great mass — “the millions” — of mankind can understand.

Thus it is Count Tolstoï answers the question, *Chto zhe dyelat'?* — “What is to be done?” He answers it theoretically, and, as far as the circumstances of his

environment allow, carries out his precepts in practical life.

Whatever one may think of this radical and far-reaching criterion of life, one cannot doubt the author's sincerity or the genuineness of his desire to help his fellow-men. Like Sakya Muni, he has renounced what the majority of men, what he himself formerly, considered the chief object of living — pleasure and self-seeking. He found that wealth, title, position, fame, amusements, were only apples of Sodom. He discovered that the greatest happiness comes from giving happiness to others. Like the Nirvana of the Buddhist, entire self-abnegation and self-forgetfulness is the highest state of happiness for man. As one's physical condition is most perfect when one is least conscious of one's vital functions, so must one seek mental and spiritual annihilation in living wholly for others. That is the key to Count Tolstor's philosophy, and he expounds it with eloquence and conviction in these pages.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

In Moscow it is impossible to pass a street without meeting beggars of a peculiar kind quite unlike those in the country, who go about there, as the saying is, "with a bag and the name of Christ."

In Moscow beggars neither carry a bag nor ask for alms. In most cases, when they meet you, they only try to catch your eye, and act according to the expression of your face.

I know of one such, a bankrupt gentleman. He is an old man, who advances slowly, limping painfully on each leg. When he meets you, he limps, and makes a bow. If you stop, he takes off his cap, furnished with a cockade, bows again, and begs. If you do not stop, he pretends only to be lame, and continues limping along.

That is a specimen of a genuine Moscow beggar, and an experienced one.

At first I did not know why such mendicants did not ask openly; but afterward I learned why, without understanding the reason.

One day I saw a policeman push a ragged peasant, all swollen from dropsy, into a cab. I asked what he had been doing, and the policeman replied:—

"Begging."

"Is begging, then, forbidden?"

"So it seems," he answered. As the man was being driven away, I took another cab, and followed. I wished to find out whether mendicancy was really forbidden, and if so, why it was. I could not at all understand how it was possible to forbid one man asking something from another; and, moreover, I had my doubts whether it was illegal in a city where it flourished to such an extent.

I entered the police station where the pauper had been taken, and asked an official armed with sword and pistol, and seated at a table, what he had been arrested for.

The man looked up at me sharply, and said, "What business is that of yours?"

However, feeling the necessity of some explanation,

he added, "The authorities order such fellows to be arrested, so I suppose it is necessary."

I went away. The policeman who had brought the man was sitting in the window of the anteroom, studying his note-book. I said to him:—

"Is it really true that poor people are not allowed to ask for alms in Christ's name?"

The man started, as if waking up from a sleep, stared at me, then relapsed again into a state of stolid indifference, and reseating himself on the window-sill said:—

"The authorities require it, so you see it is necessary."

And as he became again absorbed in his note-book, I went down the steps toward my cab.

"Well! have they locked him up?" asked the cabman. He had evidently become interested in the matter.

"They have," I answered. He shook his head.

"Is begging, then, forbidden here in Moscow?" I asked.

"I can't tell you," he said.

"How," I said, "can a man be locked up, for begging in the name of Christ?"

"Nowadays things have changed, and you see it is forbidden," he answered.

Since that time, I have seen policemen several times taking paupers to the police station, and thence to the workhouse: indeed, I once met a whole crowd of these poor creatures, about thirty, escorted before and behind by policemen. I asked what they had been doing.

"Begging," was the reply.

It appears that, according to law, mendicancy is forbidden in Moscow, notwithstanding the great number of beggars one meets there in every street, whole rows of them near the churches during service-time, and most of all at funerals. But why are some caught and locked up, while others are let alone? This I have not been able to solve. Either there are lawful and unlawful beggars amongst them, or else there are so many that it is impossible to catch them all; or, perhaps, though some are taken up, others fill their places.

There are a great variety of such mendicants in Moscow. There are those that make a living by begging. There are also honestly destitute people, such as have somehow chanced to reach Moscow, and are really in extreme need.

Amongst these last are men and women evidently from the country. I have often met such. Some of them who had fallen ill, and afterward recovered and left the hospital, could now find no means either of feeding themselves or of getting away from Moscow; some of them, besides, had taken to drink (such probably was the case of the man with dropsy whom I met); some were in good health, but had been burned out of house and home, or else were very old, or were widowed or deserted women with children; some others were sound as to health, and quite capable of working.

These robust fellows especially interested me, — the more so because, since my arrival in Moscow, I had, for the sake of exercise, contracted the habit of going to the Sparrow Hills, and working there with two peasants, who sawed wood. These men were exactly like the beggars whom I often met in the streets. One was called Peter, and was an ex-soldier from Kaluga; the other, Simon, from Vladimir. They possessed nothing save the clothes on their backs: and they earned, by working very hard, from forty to forty-five kopeks a day; out of this they both put a little aside, — the Kaluga soldier, in order to buy a fur coat; the Vladimir peasant, in order to get money enough to return to his home in the country.

Meeting, therefore, in the streets similar individuals, I was particularly interested in them, and failed to understand why some begged while others worked.

Whenever I met a beggar of this description, I used to ask him how it was that he had come to such a state. Once I met a strong, healthy-looking peasant: he asked alms. I questioned him as to who he was, and whence he had come.

He told me he had come from Kaluga, in search of work. He had at first found some, such as sawing old

timber into firewood; but after he and his companion had finished the job, though they had continually looked for more work, they had not found any; his companion had left him, and he himself had passed a fortnight in the utmost need, and, having sold all he possessed to obtain food, had not now enough even to buy the tools necessary for sawing.

I gave him the money for a saw, and told him where to go for work. I had previously arranged with Peter and Simon that they should accept a new fellow-worker, and find him a companion.

"Be sure you come! There is plenty of work to be done," I said on parting.

"You may depend on me," he answered. "Do you think there can be any pleasure in knocking about, begging, if I could work?"

The man solemnly promised that he would come; and he seemed to be honest, and really meaning to work.

Next day, on coming to my friends, Peter and Simon, I asked them whether the man had arrived. They said he had not; nor, indeed, did he come at all: and in this way I was frequently deceived.

I have also been deceived by those who stated that they only wanted a little money to buy a ticket, in order to return home, and whom I again met in the streets a few days later. Many of them I came to know well, and they knew me; though occasionally, having forgotten me, they would repeat the same false tale; but sometimes they would turn away on recognizing me.

In this way I discovered that, even in this class of men, there are many rogues.

But still, these poor rogues were also very much to be pitied; they were all of them ragged, hungry paupers; they are of the sort who die of cold in the streets, or hang themselves to escape living, as the papers frequently tell us.

CHAPTER II

WHEN I talked to my town friends about this pauperism which surrounded them, they always replied, "Oh! you have seen nothing yet! You should go to the Khitrof Market, and visit the lodging-houses there, if you want to see the genuine 'Golden Company.'"

One jovial friend of mine added that the number of these paupers had so increased, that they already formed not a "Golden Company," but a "Golden Regiment."

My lively friend was right; but he would have been yet nearer the truth had he said that these men formed, in Moscow, not a company, nor a regiment, but a whole army, — an army, I should judge, of about fifty thousand.

The regular townspeople, when they spoke to me about the pauperism of the city, always seemed to feel a certain pleasure or pride in being able to give me such precise information.

I remember I noticed, when visiting London, that the citizens there seemed also to find a certain satisfaction in telling me about London destitution, as though it were something to be proud of.

However, wishing to inspect this poverty about which I had heard so much, I turned my steps very often toward the Khitrof Market; but, on each occasion, I felt a sensation of pain and shame. "Why should you go to look at the suffering of human beings whom you cannot help?" said one voice within me. "If you live here, and see all that is pleasant in town life, go and see also what is wretched," replied another.

And so, one cold, windy day in December, two years ago, I went to the Khitrof Market, the center of the town pauperism.

It was on a week-day, about four in the afternoon. While still a good distance off, I noticed greater and greater numbers of men in strange garb, evidently not originally meant for them; and in yet stranger foot-

apparel, men of a peculiar unhealthy complexion, and all apparently showing a remarkable indifference to all that surrounded them.

Men in the strangest, most incongruous costumes sauntered along, evidently without the least thought as to how they might look in the eyes of others. They were all going in the same direction. Without asking the way, which was unknown to me, I followed them, and came to the Khitrof Market.

There I found women likewise in ragged capes, rough-looking cloaks, jackets, boots, and galoshes. Perfectly free and easy in their manner, notwithstanding the grotesque monstrosity of their attire, these women, old and young, were sitting, bargaining, strolling about, and abusing one another.

Market-time having evidently passed, there were not many people there; and, as most of them were going uphill, through the market-place, and all in the same direction, I followed them.

The farther I went, the greater became the stream of people flowing into the one road. Having passed the market, and gone up the street, I found that I was following two women, one old, the other young. Both were clothed in some gray ragged stuff. They were talking, as they walked, about some kind of business.

Every expression was unfailingly accompanied by some obscene word. They were neither of them drunk, but were absorbed with their own affairs; and the men passing, and those about them, paid not the slightest attention to their language, which sounded so strange to me. It appeared to be the generally accepted manner of speech in those parts. On the left we passed some private night lodging-houses, and some of the crowd entered them; others continued to ascend the hill toward a large corner house. The majority of the people walking along with me went into this house. In front of it, people, all of the same sort, were standing and sitting on the sidewalk and in the snow.

At the right of the entrance were women; at the left, men. I passed by the men; I passed by the women

(there were several hundreds in all), and stopped where the crowd ceased.

This building was the "Liapin free night lodging-house." The crowd was composed of night lodgers, waiting to be let in. At five o'clock in the evening this house is opened and the crowd admitted. Hither came almost all the people whom I followed.

I remained standing where the file of men ended. Those nearest to me stared at me till I had to look at them. The remnants of garments covering their bodies were very various; but the one expression of the eyes of all alike seemed to be: "Why have you, a man from another world, stopped here with us? Who are you? Are you a self-satisfied man of wealth, desiring to be gladdened by the sight of our need, to divert yourself in your idleness, and to mock at us? or are you that which does not and cannot exist,—a man who pities us?"

On all their faces the same question was written. Each would look at me, meet my eyes, and turn away again.

I wanted to speak to some one of them, but for a long time I could not summon up courage. However, eventually our mutual exchange of glances introduced us to each other; and we felt that, however widely separated were our social positions in life, after all we were fellow-men, and so ceased to be afraid of one another.

Next to me stood a peasant with a swollen face and red beard, in a ragged jacket, and worn-out galoshes on his naked feet, though there were eight degrees of frost.¹ For the third or fourth time our eyes met; and I felt so drawn to him that I was no longer ashamed to address him (to have refrained from doing so would have been the only real shame), and asked him where he came from.

He answered eagerly, while a crowd began to collect round us, that he had come from Smolensk in search of work, in order to be able to buy bread and pay his taxes.

¹ Réaumur.

"There is no work to be had nowadays," he said; "the soldiers have got hold of it all. So here am I knocking about; and God is my witness, I have not had anything to eat for two days."

He said this shyly, with an attempt at a smile. A seller of warm drinks,¹ an old soldier, was standing near. I called him, and made him pour out a glass for him. The peasant took the warm vessel in his hands, and, before drinking, warmed them against the glass, trying not to lose any of the precious heat; and whilst doing this he related to me his story.

The adventures of these people, or at least the stories which they tell, are almost always the same. He had had a little work; then it had ceased: and here, in the night lodging-house, his purse, containing his money and passport, had been stolen from him. Now he could not leave Moscow.

He told me that during the day he warmed himself in public houses, eating any stale crust of bread which might be given him. His night's lodging here in Liapin's house cost him nothing.

He was only waiting for the round of the police-sergeant to lock him up for being without his passport, when he would be sent on foot, with a party of men similarly situated, to the place of his birth.

"They say the inspection will take place on Thursday, when I shall be taken up; so I must try and keep on until then." (The prison and his compulsory journey appeared to him as the "promised land.") While he was speaking, two or three men in the crowd said they were also in exactly the same situation.

A thin, pale youth, with a long nose, only a shirt upon his back, and that torn about the shoulders, and a tattered cap on his head, edged his way to me through the crowd. He was shivering violently all the time, but tried, as he caught my eye, to smile scornfully at the peasant's talk, thinking thus to show his superiority.

I offered him some drink.

¹ A sbiten-seller; *sbiten* is a hot drink made of herbs or spices and molasses.

He warmed his hands on the tumbler as the other had done ; but just as he began to speak, he was shouldered aside by a big, black, hook-nosed, bare-headed fellow, in a thin shirt and waistcoat, who also asked for some drink.

Then a tall old man, with a thin beard, in an overcoat fastened round the waist with a cord, and in matting shoes, had some. He was drunk.

Then came a little man, with a swollen face and teary eyes, in a coarse brown jacket, and with knees protruding through his torn trousers, and knocking against each other with cold. He shivered so that he could not hold the glass, and spilled the contents over his clothes ; the others took to abusing him, but he only grinned miserably, and shivered.

After him came an ugly, deformed man in rags, and with bare feet. Then an individual of the officer type ; another belonging to the church class ; then a strange-looking being without a nose, — and all of them hungry, cold, suppliant, and humble, — crowded round me, and stretched out their hands for the glass ; but the drink was exhausted. Then one man asked for money ; I gave him some. A second and a third followed, till the whole crowd pressed on me. In the general confusion the gatekeeper of the neighboring house shouted to the crowd to clear the pavement before his house, and the people submissively obeyed.

Some of them undertook to control the tumult, and took me under their protection. They attempted to drag me out of the crush. But the crowd that formerly had lined the pavement in a long file, now had become condensed about me. Every one looked at me and begged ; and it seemed as if each face were more pitiful, harassed, and degraded than the other. I distributed all the money I had, — only about twenty rubles, — and entered the lodging-house with the crowd. The house was enormous, and consisted of four parts. In the upper stories were the men's rooms ; on the ground floor the women's. I went first into the women's dormitory, — a large room, filled with beds resembling the

berths in a third-class railway-carriage. They were arranged in two tiers, one above the other.

Strange-looking women in ragged dresses, without jackets, old and young, kept coming in and occupying places, some below, others climbing above. Some of the elder ones crossed themselves, pronouncing the name of the founder of the refuge. Some laughed and swore.

I went up-stairs. There, in a similar way, the men had taken their places. Amongst them I recognized one of those to whom I had given money. On seeing him I suddenly felt horribly ashamed, and made haste to leave.

And with a sense of having committed some crime, I returned home. There I entered along the carpeted steps into the rug-covered hall, and, having taken off my fur coat, sat down to a meal of five courses, served by two footmen in livery, with white ties and white gloves. And a scene of the past came suddenly before me. Thirty years ago I saw a man's head cut off under the guillotine in Paris before a crowd of thousands of spectators. I was aware that the man had been a great criminal; I was acquainted with all the arguments in justification of capital punishment for such offenses. I saw this execution carried out deliberately; but at the moment that the head and body were severed from each other by the keen blade, I gasped, and realized in every fiber of my being, that all the arguments which I had hitherto heard upon capital punishment were wickedly false; that, no matter how many might agree as to its being a lawful act, it was literally murder; whatever other title men might give it, they thus had virtually committed murder, that worst of all crimes: and there was I, both by my silence and my non-interference, an aider, abetter, and participator in the sin.

Similar convictions were now again forced upon me when I beheld the misery, cold, hunger, and humiliation of thousands of my fellow-men. I realized not only with my brain, but in every pulse of my soul, that, whilst there were thousands of such sufferers in Moscow, I, with tens of thousands of others, filled myself daily to

repletion with luxurious dainties of every description, took the tenderest care of my horses, and clothed my very floors with velvet carpets !

Whatever the wise and learned of the world might say about it, however unalterable the course of life might seem to be, the same evil was continually being enacted, and I, by my own personal habits of luxury, was a promoter of that evil.

The difference between the two cases was only this : that in the first, all I could have done would have been to shout out to the murderers standing near the guillotine, who were accomplishing the deed, that they were committing a murder, though of course knowing that my interference would have been in vain. Whereas, in this second case, I might have given away, not only the drink and the small sum of money I had with me, but also the coat from off my shoulders, and all that I possessed at home. Yet I had not done so, and therefore felt, and feel, and can never cease to feel, myself a partaker in a crime which is continually being committed, so long as I have superfluous food whilst others have none, so long as I have two coats whilst there exists one man without any.

CHAPTER III

ON the same evening that I returned from Liapin's house, I imparted my impressions to a friend, and he, a resident of the town, began to explain to me, not without a certain satisfaction, that this was the most natural state of things in a town ; that it was only owing to my provincialism that I found anything remarkable in it ; and that it had ever been, and ever would be, so, such being one of the inevitable conditions of civilization. In London it was yet worse, . . . therefore there could be nothing wrong about it, and there was nothing to be disturbed and troubled about.

I began to argue with my friend, but with such warmth and so angrily, that my wife rushed in from the

adjoining room to ask what had happened. It appeared that I had, without being aware of it, shouted out in an agonized voice, gesticulating wildly, "We should not go on living in this way! we must not live so! we have no right!" I was rebuked for my unnecessary excitement; I was told that I could not talk quietly upon any question; that I was irritable; and it was pointed out to me that the existence of such misery as I had witnessed should in no way be a reason for embittering the life of my home circle.

I felt that this was perfectly just, and held my tongue; but in the depth of my soul I knew that I was right, and I could not quiet my conscience.

The town life, which had previously seemed alien and strange to me, became now so hateful that all the indulgences of a luxurious existence, in which I had formerly delighted, now served to torment me.

However much I tried to find some kind of excuse for my mode of life, I could not contemplate without irritation either my own or other people's drawing-rooms, nor a clean, richly served dinner-table, nor a carriage with well-fed coachman and horses, nor the shops, theaters, and entertainments. I could not help seeing, in contrast with all this, those hungry, shivering, and degraded inhabitants of the night lodging-house. And I could never free myself from the thought that these two conditions were inseparable—that the one proceeded from the other. I remember that the sense of culpability which I had felt from the first moment never left me; but with this feeling another soon became mingled, which lessened the first.

When I talked to my intimate friends and acquaintances about my impressions on Liapin's house, they all answered in the same way, and expressed besides their appreciation of my kindness and tender-heartedness, and gave me to understand that the sight had so impressed me because I, Leo Tolstoy, was kind-hearted and good. And I willingly allowed myself to believe it.

The natural consequence of this was that the first keen sense of self-reproach and shame was blunted, and

was replaced by a sense of satisfaction at my own virtue, and a desire to make it known to others. "It is in truth," I said to myself, "probably not my connection with a luxurious life which is at fault, but the unavoidable circumstances of life. And thus a change in my particular life cannot alter the evil which I have seen."

In changing my own life, I should only render myself and those nearest and dearest to me miserable, whilst that other misery would remain the same; and therefore my object should be, not to alter my own way of living, as I had at first imagined, but to try as much as was in my power to ameliorate the position of those unfortunate ones who had excited my compassion.

The whole matter, I reasoned, lies in the fact that I, being an extremely kind and good man, wish to do good to my fellow-men. And I began to arrange a plan of philanthropic activity in which I might exhibit all my virtues. I must, however, here remark that, while planning this charitable effort, in the depth of my heart I felt that I was not doing the right thing; but, as too often happens, reason and imagination were stifling the voice of conscience. About this time the census was being taken, and it seemed to me a good opportunity for instituting that charitable organization in which I wanted to shine.

I was acquainted with many philanthropic institutions and societies already existing in Moscow, but all their activity seemed to me both wrongly directed and insignificant in comparison with what I myself wished to do. And this was what I invented to excite sympathy amongst the rich people for the poor: I began to collect money, and enlist men who wished to help in the work, and who would, in company with the census officers, visit all the nests of pauperism, entering into relations with the poor, finding out the details of their needs, helping them with money and work, sending them out of Moscow, placing their children in schools, and their old men and women in homes and houses of refuge.

I thought, moreover, that, from those who undertook this work, there could be formed a permanent society,

which, dividing between its members the various districts of Moscow, would take care that new cases of want and misery should be avoided, and so by degrees stifle pauperism at its very birth, accomplishing their task, not so much by cure, as by prevention.

I already saw, in the future, begging and poverty entirely disappearing, I having been the means of its accomplishment. Then all of us who were rich could go on living in all our luxury as before, dwelling in fine houses, eating dinners of five courses, driving in our carriages to theaters and entertainments, and no longer being harassed by such sights as I had witnessed at Liapin's house.

Having invented this plan, I wrote an article about it; and, before even giving it to be printed, I went to those acquaintances from whom I hoped to obtain coöperation, and expounded to all whom I visited that day (chiefly the rich) the ideas I afterward published in my article.

I proposed to profit by the census in order to study the state of pauperism in Moscow, and to help to exterminate it by personal effort and money, after which we might all with a quiet conscience enjoy our usual pleasures. All listened to me attentively and seriously; but, in every case, I remarked that the moment my hearers came to understand what I was driving at, they seemed to become uncomfortable and somewhat embarrassed. But it was principally, I feel sure, on my account; because they considered all that I said to be folly. It seemed as though some other motive compelled my listeners to agree for the moment with my foolishness. "Oh, yes! Certainly. It would be delightful," they said. "Of course it is impossible not to sympathize with you. Your idea is splendid. I myself have had the same; but.... people here are so indifferent, that it is hardly reasonable to expect a great success. However, as far as I am concerned, I am, of course, ready to share in the enterprise."

Similar answers I received from all. They consented, as it appeared to me, not because they were persuaded

by my arguments, nor in compliance with my request, but because of some exterior reason, which rendered it impossible for them to refuse.

I remarked this partly because none of those who promised me their help in the form of money, defined the sum they meant to give ; so that I had to name the amount by asking, " May I count upon you for twenty-five, or one hundred, or two hundred, or three hundred, rubles ? " And not one of them paid the money. I draw attention to this fact, because, when people are going to pay for what they are anxious to have, they are generally in haste to give it. Suppose it were to secure a box to see Sarah Bernhardt, the money is immediately produced. Here, however, of all who agreed to give, and expressed their sympathy, no one immediately produced the amount, but merely silently acquiesced in the sum I happened to name.

In the last house I visited that day, there was a large party. The mistress of the house had for some years been employed in works of charity. Several carriages were waiting at the door of the house. Footmen in expensive liveries were seated in the hall. In the spacious drawing-room, ladies, old and young, wearing rich dresses and ornaments, were talking to some young men, and dressing up small dolls, destined for a lottery in aid of the poor.

The sight of this drawing-room, and of the people assembled there, struck me very painfully. For not only was their property worth several million rubles ; not only could the interest on the capital spent here on dresses, laces, bronzes, jewels, carriages, horses, liveries, footmen, exceed a hundred times the value of these ladies' work ; not only was this the case, — but even the expenses caused by this very party of ladies and gentlemen, the gloves, linen, candles, tea, sugar, cakes, all this represented a sum a hundred times exceeding the value of the work done.

I saw all this, and therefore might have understood that here, at all events, I should not find sympathy for my plan ; but I had come in order to give an invitation,

and, however painful it was to me, I said what I wished to say, repeating almost the words of my article.

One lady present offered me some money, adding that, owing to her sensibilities, she did not feel strong enough to visit the poor herself, but that she would give help in this form. How much money, and when she would give it, she did not say. Another lady and a young man offered their services in visiting the poor, but I did not profit by their offer. The principal person I addressed told me that it would be impossible to do much, because the means were not forthcoming. And the means were scarce, because all the rich men in Moscow who were known, and could be counted upon, had given all it was possible to get from them; their charities having already been rewarded with titles, medals, and other distinctions, this being the only effectual method of insuring success in the collection of money, — namely, to obtain new honors from the authorities, and that being very difficult.

Having returned home, I went to bed, not only with a presentiment that nothing would result from my idea, but also with the shameful consciousness of having, during the whole day, been doing something vile and contemptible. However, I did not desist.

First, the work had been begun, and false shame would have prevented my giving it up; secondly, not only the success of the enterprise itself, but even my occupation in it, afforded me the possibility of continuing to live in my usual way; whereas, the failure of this enterprise would have put me under the constraint of giving up my present mode of life, and of seeking another. Of this I was unconsciously afraid; therefore, I refused to listen to my inner voice, and continued what I had begun.

Having sent my article to be printed, I read a proof-copy at a census meeting in the town hall, hesitatingly and blushing till my cheeks burned again, so uncomfortable did I feel.

I saw that all my hearers felt equally uncomfortable. Upon my question whether the managers of the cen-

sus would accept my proposal that they should remain at their posts in order to form a link between society and those in need, an awkward silence ensued.

Then two of those present made speeches, which seemed to mend the awkwardness of my suggestion; sympathy for me was expressed along with their general approbation. They, however, pointed out the impracticability of my scheme. Every one seemed more at ease; but afterward, when, still wishing to succeed, I asked each district manager separately, whether he was willing during the census to investigate the needs of the poor, and afterward remain at his post in order to form this link between the poor and the rich, all again were confounded; it seemed as though their looks said, "Why, out of personal regard for you, we have listened to your silly proposition; but here you come out with it again!" Such was the expression of their faces, but in words they told me that they consented; and two of them, separately, but as though they had agreed together, said in the same words, "We regard it as our moral duty to do so." The same impression was produced by my words upon the students who had volunteered to act as clerks during the census, when I told them that they might then, besides their scientific pursuits, accomplish also a charitable work.

When we talked the matter over, I noticed that they were shy of looking me straight in the face, as one often hesitates to look into the face of a good-natured man who is talking nonsense. The same impression was produced by my article upon the editor of the paper when I handed it to him; also upon my son, my wife, and various other people. Every one seemed embarrassed, but all found it necessary to approve of the idea itself; and all, immediately after this approbation, began to express their doubts as to the success of the plan, and, for some reason or other (all without exception), took to condemning the indifference and coldness of society and of the world, though evidently excluding themselves.

In the depth of my soul, I continued to feel that all

this was not the right thing, that nothing would come of it; but the article had been printed, and I had agreed to take part in the census. I had put a plan into action, and now the plan itself drew me along.

CHAPTER IV

IN accordance with my request, the part of the town was assigned to me for the census which contained the houses generally known under the name of the Rzhanoff lodgings. I had long before heard that they were considered to be the lowest circle of poverty and vice, and that was the reason that I asked the officers of the census to assign me this district.

My desire was gratified.

Having received the appointment from the town council, I went, a few days before the census, alone, to inspect my district. With the help of the plan I was furnished with, I soon found the Rzhanoff Houses, — approached by a street which terminated on the left-hand side of a gloomy building without any apparent entrance. From the aspect of this house, I guessed it was the one I was in search of. On descending the street, I had come across some boys, from ten to fourteen years old, in short coats, sliding down the frozen gutter, some on their feet, others upon a single skate.

The boys were ragged, and, like all town boys, sharp and bold. I stopped to look at them. An old woman in torn clothes, with hanging yellow cheeks, came round the corner. She was going uphill, and, like a horse out of wind, gasped painfully at every step; and, when abreast of me, she stopped with hoarse, choking breath. In any other place, this old woman would have asked alms of me, but here she only began to talk.

“Just look at them!” she said, pointing to the sliding boys; “always at mischief! They will become the same Rzhanoff good-for-nothings as their fathers.” One boy, in an overcoat and vizzorless cap, overhearing her

words, stopped. "You shut up!" he shouted. "You're only an old Rzhanoff goat yourself!"

I asked the boy if he lived here. "Yes, and so does she. She stole some boots," he called out, and, pushing himself off, slid on.

The woman gave vent to a torrent of abuse, interrupted by her cough. During this squabble an old, white-haired man, all in rags, came down the middle of the street, brandishing his arms, and carrying in one hand a bundle of small loaves. He seemed to have just fortified himself with a glass of liquor. He had evidently heard the old woman's abuse, and took her side.

"I'll give it you, you little devils, you!" he cried out, pretending to rush after them; and, having passed behind me, he stepped upon the pavement. If you saw this old man in a fashionable street, you would be struck with his air of decrepitude, feebleness, and poverty. Here he appeared in the character of a merry workman, returning from his day's labor.

I followed him. He turned round the corner to the left into an alley; and, having passed the front of the house and the gate, he disappeared through the door of an inn. Into this alley the doors of the latter, a public house, and several small eating-houses, opened. It was the Rzhanoff Houses. Everything was gray, dirty, and foul-smelling, — buildings, lodgings, courts, and people. Most of those I met here were in tattered clothes, half-naked. Some were passing along, others were running from one door to another. Two were bargaining about some rags. I went round the whole building, down another lane and a court, and, having returned, stopped at the archway of the Rzhanoff Houses.

I wanted to go in and see what was going on inside, but the idea made me feel painfully awkward. What should I say if they asked me what I had come for?

However, after a little hesitation, I went in. The moment I entered the court, I was conscious of a most revolting odor. The court was dreadfully dirty. I

turned round the corner, and at the same instant heard the steps of people running along the boards of the gallery, and thence down the stairs.

First a gaunt-looking woman, with tucked-up sleeves, faded pink dress, and shoes on her stockingless feet, rushed out; after her, a rough-haired man in a red shirt and extremely wide trousers, like a petticoat, and with galoshes on his feet. The man caught her under the stairs: "You shan't escape me," he said, laughing.

"Just listen to the squint-eyed devil!" began the woman, who was evidently not averse to his attentions; but, having caught sight of me, she exclaimed angrily, "Who are you looking for?" As I did not want any one in particular, I felt somewhat confused, and went away.

This little incident, though by no means remarkable in itself, suddenly showed to me the work I was about to undertake in an entirely new light, especially after what I had seen on the other side of the courtyard, — the scolding old woman, the light-hearted old man, and the sliding boys. I had meditated doing good to these people by the help of the rich men of Moscow. I now realized for the first time, that all these poor unfortunates, whom I had been wishing to help, had, besides the time they spent suffering from cold and hunger, in waiting to get a lodging, several hours daily to get through, and that they must somehow fill up the rest of the twenty-four hours of every day, — a whole life, of which I had never thought before. I realized now, for the first time, that all these people, besides the mere effort to find food and shelter from the cold, must live through the rest of every day of their life as other people have to do, must get angry at times, and be dull, and try to appear light-hearted, and be sad or merry. And now, for the first time (however strange the confession may sound), I was fully aware that the task which I was undertaking could not simply consist in feeding and clothing a thousand people (just as one might feed a thousand head of sheep, and drive them into shelter), but must develop some more essential help. And when I

considered that each one of these individuals was just another man as myself, possessing also a past history, with the same passions, temptations, and errors, the same thoughts, the same questions to be answered, then suddenly the work before me appeared stupendous, and I felt my own utter helplessness ; — but it had been begun, and I was resolved to continue it.

CHAPTER V

ON the appointed day, the students who were to assist me started early in the morning ; while I, the instigator, only joined them at twelve o'clock. I could not come earlier, as I did not get up till ten, after which I had to take some coffee, and then smoke for the sake of my digestion. Twelve o'clock then found me at the door of the Rzhanoff Houses. A policeman showed me a public house, to which the census-clerks referred all those who wished to inquire for them. I entered, and found it very dirty and unsavory. Here, right in front of me, was a counter ; to the left a small room, furnished with tables covered with soiled napkins ; to the right a large room on pillars, containing similar little tables placed in the windows and along the walls ; and men here and there having tea, some very ragged, others well dressed, apparently workmen or small shopkeepers. There were also several women. In spite of the dirt, it was easy to see by the business air of the man in charge, and the ready, obliging manners of the waiter, that the eating-house was driving a good trade. I had no sooner entered than one of the waiters was already preparing to assist me in getting off my overcoat, and anxious to take my orders, showing that evidently the people here were in the habit of doing their work quickly and readily.

My inquiry for the census-clerks was answered by a call for "Vanya" from a little man dressed in foreign fashion, who was arranging something in a cupboard behind the counter. This was the proprietor of the

public house, a peasant from Kaluga, Ivan Fedotitch by name, who also rented half of the other houses, subletting the rooms to lodgers. In answer to his call, a thin, sallow-faced, hook-nosed lad, of some eighteen years, came forward hastily; and the landlord said, "Take this gentleman to the clerks; they have gone to the main body of the building over the well."

The lad put down his napkin, pulled a coat on over his white shirt and trousers, picked up a large cap; then, with quick, short steps, he led the way by a back door through the buildings. At the entrance of a greasy, malodorous kitchen we met an old woman, who was carefully carrying in a rag some putrid tripe. We descended into a court, built up all round with wooden buildings on stone foundations. The smell was most offensive, and seemed to be concentrated in a privy, to which numbers of people were constantly resorting. This awful cesspool forced itself upon one's notice by the pestilential atmosphere around it.

The boy, taking care not to soil his white trousers, led me cautiously across frozen and unfrozen filth, and approached one of the buildings. The people crossing the yard and the galleries all stopped to gaze at me. It was evident that a cleanly dressed man was an unusual sight in the place.

The boy asked a woman whom we met, whether she had seen where the census officials had entered, and three people at once answered his question: some said that they were over the well; others said that they had been there, but had now gone to Nikita Ivanovitch's.

An old man in the middle of the court, who had only a shirt on, said that they were at No. 30. The boy concluded that this information was the most probable, and led me to No. 30, into the basement, where darkness and a bad smell, different from that which filled the court, prevailed.

We continued to descend along a dark passage. As we were traversing it, a door was suddenly opened; and out of it came a drunken old man in a shirt, evidently not of the peasant class. A shrieking washerwoman,

with tucked-up sleeves and soapy arms, was pushing him out of the room. "Vanya" (my guide) shoved him aside, saying, "It won't do to kick up such a row here — and you an officer too!"

When we arrived at No. 30, Vanya pulled the door, which opened with the sound of a wet slap; and we felt a gush of soapy steam, and an odor of bad food and tobacco, and entered into complete darkness. The windows were on the other side; and we were in a crooked corridor, that went right and left, and with doors leading, at different angles, into rooms separated from it by a partition of unevenly laid boards, roughly white-washed.

In a dark room to the left we could see a woman washing at a trough. Another old woman was looking out of a door at the right. Near an open door was a hairy, red-skinned peasant in bark shoes, sitting on a couch. His hands rested upon his knees; and he was swinging his feet, and looking sadly at his shoes.

At the end of the passage was a small door leading into the room where the census officers were assembled. This was the room of the landlady of the whole of No. 30. She rented the apartment from Ivan Fedotitch, and sublet the rooms to ordinary or night lodgers.

In this tiny room a student sat under an image glittering with gilt paper, and, with the air of a magistrate, was putting questions to a man dressed in shirt and vest. This last was a friend of the landlady's, who was answering the questions in her stead. The landlady herself, — an old woman, — and two inquisitive lodgers were also present.

When I entered, the room was quite filled up. I pushed through to the table, shook hands with the student, and he went on extracting his information; while I studied the inhabitants, and put questions to them for my own ends.

It appeared, however, I could find no one here upon whom to bestow my benevolence. The landlady of the rooms, notwithstanding their wretchedness and filth (which especially struck me in comparison with the

mansion in which I lived), was well off, even from the point of view of town poverty; and, compared with the country destitution, with which I was well acquainted, she lived luxuriously. She had a feather-bed, a quilted blanket, a samovar, a fur cloak, a cupboard, with dishes, plates, etc. The landlady's friend had the same well-to-do appearance, and boasted even a watch and chain. The lodgers were poor, but among them there was no one requiring immediate help.

Three only applied for aid, — the woman washing linen, who said she had been abandoned by her husband; an old widowed woman, without means of livelihood; and the peasant in the ragged shoes, who told me he had not had anything to eat that day. But, upon gathering more precise information, it became evident that all these people were not in extreme want, and that, in order really to help, it would be necessary to become more intimately acquainted with them.

When I offered the washerwoman to place her children in a "home," she became confused, thought over it some time, then thanked me much, but evidently did not desire it; she wished rather to be given some money. Her eldest daughter helped her in the washing, and the second acted as nurse to the little boy.

The old woman asked to be put into a refuge; but, upon examining her corner, I saw that she was not in dire distress. She had a box containing her property; she had a teapot, two cups, and old bonbon boxes with tea and sugar. She knitted stockings and gloves, and received a monthly allowance from a lady benefactress.

The peasant was evidently more desirous of wetting his throat after his last day's drunkenness than of food, and anything given him would have gone to the public house. In these rooms, therefore, there was no one whom I could have rendered in any respect happier by helping them with money.

There were only paupers there, — and paupers, it seemed to me, of a questionable kind.

I put down the names of the old woman, the laundress, and the peasant, and settled in my mind that it

would be necessary to do something for them, but that first I should aid those other especially unfortunate ones whom I expected to come across in this house. I made up my mind that some system was necessary in distributing the aid which we had to give: first, we should find the most needy, and then come to such as these.

But in the next lodging, and in the next again, I found only similar cases, which would have to be looked into more closely before being helped. Of those whom pecuniary aid alone would have rendered happy, I found none.

However ashamed I feel in confessing it, I began to experience a certain disappointment at not finding in these houses anything resembling what I had expected. I thought to find very exceptional people; but, when I had gone over all the lodgings, I became convinced that their inhabitants were in no way extremely peculiar, but much like those amongst whom I lived.

As with us, so also with them, there were some more or less good, and others more or less bad; there were some more or less happy, and others more or less unhappy. Those who were unhappy amongst them would have been equally wretched with us, their misery being within themselves, — a misery not to be mended by any kind of bank-note.

CHAPTER VI

THE inhabitants of these houses belonged to the lowest population of the town, which in Moscow amounts to perhaps more than a hundred thousand. In this house, there were representative men of all kinds, — petty employers and journeymen, shoemakers, brush-makers, joiners, hackney coachmen, jobbers carrying on business on their own account, washerwomen, second-hand dealers, money-lenders, day-laborers, and others without any definite occupation; here also lodged beggars and women of the town.

Many like those whom I had seen waiting in front of Liapin's house lived here, but they were mixed up with

the working-people; and, besides, those whom I then saw were in a most wretched condition, when, having eaten and drunk all they had, they were turned out of the public house, and, cold and hungry, were waiting, as for heavenly manna, to be admitted into the free night lodging-house,—day by day longing to be taken to prison, in order to be sent back to their respective homes. Here I saw the same men among a greater number of working-people, and at a time when, by some means or other, they had got a few farthings to pay for their night's lodging, and perhaps a ruble or two for food and drink.

However strange it may sound, I had no such feelings here as I experienced in Liapin's house; but on the contrary, during my first visiting round, I and the students had a sensation which was rather agreeable than otherwise. I might even say it was entirely agreeable.

My first impression was that the majority of those lodging here were working-men, and very kindly disposed. We found most of the lodgers at work,—the washerwomen at their tubs, the joiners by their benches, the bootmakers at their lasts. The tiny rooms were full of people, and the work was going on cheerfully and with energy. There was a smell of perspiration among the workmen, of leather at the bootmaker's, of chips in the carpenter's shop. We often heard songs, and saw bare, sinewy arms working briskly and skilfully.

Everywhere we were received kindly and cheerfully. Nearly everywhere our intrusion into the daily life of these people excited in them no desire to show us their importance, or to rate us soundly, as happens when such visits are paid to the lodgings of well-to-do people. On the contrary, all our questions were answered respectfully without any particular importance being attached to them,—served, indeed, only as an excuse for them to be merry, and to joke as to how they were to be enrolled on the list; how such a one was as good as two, and how two others ought to be reckoned as one.

Many we found at dinner or at tea; and each time, in answer to our greeting, "Bread and salt," or, "Tea and sugar," they said, "You are welcome;" and some even

made room for us to sit down. Instead of the place being the resort of an ever shifting population, such as we expected to find here, it turned out that in this house were many rooms which had been tenanted by the same people for long periods.

One carpenter, with his workmen, and a bootmaker, with his journeymen, had been living here for ten years. The bootmaker's shop was very dirty and quite choked up, but all his men were working very cheerily. I tried to talk with one of the workmen, wishing to sound him about the miseries of his lot, what he owed to the master, and so forth; but he did not understand me, and spoke of his master and of his life from a very favorable point of view.

In one lodging there lived an old man with his old wife. They dealt in apples. Their room was warm, clean, and filled with their belongings. The floor was covered with matting made of apple sacks. There were chests, a cupboard, a samovar, and crockery. In the corner were many holy images, before which two lamps were burning; on the wall hung fur cloaks wrapped up in a sheet. The old woman, with wrinkled face, kind and talkative, was apparently herself delighted with her quiet, respectable life.

Ivan Fedotitch, the owner of the inn and of the lodgings, came out and walked with us. He joked kindly with many of the lodgers, calling them all by their names, and giving us short sketches of their characters. They were as other men, did not consider themselves unhappy, but believed they were like every one else, as in reality they were. We were prepared to see only dreadful things, and we met instead objects, not only not repulsive, but estimable. And there were so many of them, compared with the ragged, ruined, unoccupied people we met now and then among them, that the latter did not in the least destroy a general impression. To the students it did not appear so remarkable as it did to me. They were merely performing an act, as they thought, useful to science, and, in passing, made casual observations: but I was a benefactor; my object in going there was to

nelp the unhappy, ruined, depraved men and women whom I had expected to meet in this house. And suddenly, instead of unhappy, ruined, depraved beings, I found the majority to be working-men, quiet, satisfied, cheerful, kind, and very good.

I was still more strongly impressed when I found that in these lodgings the crying want I wished to relieve had already been relieved before I came. But by whom? By these same unhappy, depraved beings whom I was prepared to save; and this help was given in a way not open to me.

In one cellar lay a lonely old man suffering from typhus fever. He had no connections in the world; yet a woman, — a widow with a little girl, — quite a stranger to him, but living in the corner next to him, nursed him, and gave him tea, and bought him medicine with her own money.

In another lodging lay a woman in puerperal fever. A woman of the town was nursing her child, and had prepared a sucking-bottle for him, and had not gone out to ply her sad trade for two days.

An orphan girl was taken into the family of a tailor, who had three children of his own. Thus, there remained only such miserable unoccupied men as retired officials, clerks, men-servants out of situations, beggars, tipsy people, prostitutes, children, whom it was not possible to help all at once by means of money, but whose cases it was necessary to consider carefully before assisting them. I had been seeking for men suffering from want of means, whom one might be able to help by sharing one's superfluities with them. I had not found them. All those I had seen it would have been very difficult to assist materially without devoting time and care to them.

CHAPTER VII

THESE unfortunate people ranged themselves in my mind under three heads: first, those who had lost former advantageous positions, and who were waiting to

return to them (such men belong to the lowest as well as to the highest classes of society); secondly, women of the town, who are very numerous in these houses; and thirdly, children.

The majority of those I found, and noted down, were men who had lost former places, and were desirous of returning to them. Such men were also numerous, being chiefly of the better class, and government officials. In almost all the lodgings we entered with the landlord, we were told, "Here we need not trouble to fill up the residential card ourselves; there is a man here who is able to do it, provided he is not tipsy."

And Ivan Fedotitch would call by name some such individual, who always belonged to this class of ruined people of a higher grade. When thus summoned, the man, if he were not tipsy, was always willing to undertake the task; he kept nodding his head with a sense of importance, knitted his brows, inserted now and then learned terms in his remarks, and, carefully holding in his dirty, trembling hands the neat pink card, looked round at his fellow-lodgers with pride and contempt, as if he were now, by the superiority of his education, triumphing over those who had been continually humbling him.

He was evidently pleased with having intercourse with the world which used pink cards, with a world of which he himself had once been a member.

To my questions about his life, this kind of man not only replied willingly, but with enthusiasm, — beginning to tell a story, fixed in his mind like a prayer, about all kinds of misfortunes which had happened to him, and chiefly about his former position, in which, considering his education, he ought to have remained.

Many such people are scattered about in all the tenements of the Rzhanoﬀ Houses. One lodging-house was tenanted exclusively by them, women and men. As we approached them, Ivan Fedotitch said, "Now, here's where the nobility live."

The lodging was full; almost all the lodgers — about forty persons — were at home. In the whole house,

there were no faces so ruined and degraded-looking as these, — if old, flabby ; if young, pale and haggard.

I talked with several of them. Almost always the same story was told, only in different degrees of development. One and all had been once rich, or had still a rich father or brother or uncle ; or either his father or the unfortunate himself had held a high office. Then came some misfortune caused by envious enemies or his own imprudent kindness, or some out-of-the-way occurrence ; and, having lost everything, he was obliged to descend to these strange and hateful surroundings, among lice and rags, in company with drunkards and loose characters, feeding upon bread and liver, and subsisting by beggary.

All the thoughts, desires, and recollections of these men are turned toward the past. The present appears to them as something unnatural, hideous, and unworthy of attention. The present does not exist for them. They have only recollections of the past, and expectations of the future, which may be realized at any moment, and for the attainment of which but very little is needed ; but, unfortunately, this little is out of their reach ; it cannot be got anywhere ; and so they perish needlessly, one sooner, another later.

One needs only to be dressed respectably, in order to call on a well-known person who is kindly disposed toward him ; another requires only to be dressed, have his debts paid, and go to some town or other ; a third wants to take his effects out of pawn, and get a small sum to carry on a lawsuit, which must be decided in his favor, and then all will be well again. All say that they have need of some external circumstance in order to regain that position which they think natural and happy for them.

If I had not been blinded by my pride in being a benefactor, I should have needed only to look a little closer into their faces, young and old, which were generally weak, sensual, but kind, in order to understand that their misfortunes could not be met by exterior means ; that they could be happy in no situation while

their present conception of life remained the same; that they were by no means peculiar people in peculiarly unhappy circumstances, but that they were like all other men, ourselves included.

I remember well how my intercourse with men of this class was particularly trying to me. I now understand why it was so. In them I saw my own self as in a mirror. If I had considered carefully my own life, and the lives of people of my own class, I should have seen that, between us and these unfortunate men, there existed no essential difference.

Those who live around me in expensive suites of apartments, and houses of their own in the best streets of the city, eating something better, too, than liver or herring with their bread, are none the less unhappy. They also are discontented with their lot, regret the past, and desire a happier future, precisely as did the wretched tenants of the Rzhanoﬀ Houses. Both wish to work less, and to be worked for more, the difference between them being only in degrees of idleness.

Unfortunately, I did not see this at first, nor did I understand that such people needed to be relieved, not by my charity, but of their own false views of the world; and that, to change a man's estimate of life, he must be given one more accurate than his own, which unhappily, not possessing myself, I could not communicate to others.

These men were unhappy, not because, to use an illustration, they had not nourishing food, but because their stomachs were spoiled; and they required, not nourishment, but a tonic. I did not see that in order to help them it was not necessary to give them food, but to teach them how to eat. Though I am anticipating, I must say that, of all these people whose names I put down, I did not in reality help one, notwithstanding that all some of them had desired was done in order to relieve them. Of these I became acquainted with three men in particular. All three, after many failures and much assistance, are now just in the same position in which they were three years ago.

CHAPTER VIII

THE second class of unfortunates, whom I hoped afterward to be able to help, were women of the town. Such women were very numerous in the Rzhanoff Houses; and they were of every kind, from young girls still bearing some likeness to women, to old and fearful-looking creatures without a vestige of humanity. The hope of helping these women, whom I had not at first in view, was aroused by the following circumstances.

When we had just finished half our visiting tour, we had already acquired a somewhat mechanical method. On entering a new lodging, we at once asked for the landlord. One of us sat down, clearing a space to write; and the other went from one to another, questioning each man and woman in the room, and reporting the information obtained to the one who was writing.

On our entering one of the basement lodgings, the student went to look for the landlord; and I began to question all who were in the place. This place was thus divided: In the middle of the room, which was four yards square, there stood a stove. From the stove radiated four partitions or screens, making a similar number of small compartments. In the first of these, which had two doors in it opposite each other, and four pallets, were an old man and a woman. Next to it was a rather long but narrow room, in which was the landlord, a young, pale, good-looking man, dressed in a gray woolen coat. To the left of the first division there was a third small room, where a man was sleeping, seemingly tipsy, and a woman in a pink dressing-gown. The fourth compartment was behind a partition, access to it being through the landlord's room.

The student entered the latter, while I remained in the first, questioning the old man and the woman. The former had been a type-setter, but had now no means of livelihood whatever.

The woman was a cook's wife.

I went into the third compartment, and asked the

woman in the dressing-gown about the man who was asleep.

She answered that he was a visitor.

I asked her who she was.

She replied that she was a peasant girl from the county of Moscow.

"What is your occupation?" She laughed, and made no answer.

"What do you do for your living?" I repeated, thinking she had not understood the question.

"I sit in the inn," she said.

I did not understand her, and asked again:—

"What are your means of living?"

She gave me no answer, but continued to giggle. In the fourth room, where we had not yet been, I heard the voices of women also giggling.

The landlord came out of his room, and approached us. He had evidently heard my questions and the woman's answers. He glanced sternly at her, and, turning to me, said, "She is a prostitute;" and it was evident that he was pleased that he knew this word, which is the one used in official circles, and at having pronounced it correctly. And having said this with a respectful smile of satisfaction toward me, he turned to the woman. As he did so, the expression of his face changed. In a peculiarly contemptuous manner, and with rapid utterance as one would speak to a dog, he said without looking at her, "Don't be a fool! Instead of saying you sit in the inn, speak plainly and say you are a prostitute. — She does not even yet know her proper name," he said, turning to me.

This manner of speaking shocked me.

"It is not for us to shame her," I said. "If we were all living according to God's commandment, there would be no such persons."

"Yes, yes; of course you are right," said the landlord, with a forced smile.

"Therefore we must pity them, and not reproach them as if it were their own fault entirely."

I do not remember exactly what I said. I remember

only that I was disgusted by the disdainful tone of this young landlord, in a lodging filled with females whom he termed prostitutes; and I pitied the woman, and expressed both feelings.

No sooner had I said this, than I heard from the small compartment where the giggling had been, the noise of creaking bed-boards; and over the partition, which did not reach to the ceiling, appeared the disheveled curly head of a female with small swollen eyes and a shining red face; a second and then a third head followed. They were evidently standing on their beds; and all three were stretching their necks and holding their breath, and looking silently at me with strained attention.

A painful silence followed.

The student, who had been smiling before this happened, now became grave; the landlord became confused, and cast down his eyes; and the women continued to look at me in expectation.

I felt more disconcerted than all the rest. I had certainly not expected that a casual word would produce such an effect. It was like the field of battle covered with dead bones seen by the prophet Ezekiel, on which, trembling from contact with the spirit, the dead bones began to move. I had casually uttered a word of love and pity, which produced upon all such an effect that it seemed as if they had been only waiting for it, to cease to be corpses, and to become alive again.

They continued to look at me, as if wondering what would come next, as if waiting for me to say those words and do those acts by which these dry bones would begin to come together, — be covered with flesh and receive life.

But I felt, alas! that I had no such words or deeds to give, or to continue as I had begun. In the depth of my soul I felt that I had told a lie, that I myself was like them, that I had nothing more to say; and I began to write down on the domiciliary card the names and the occupations of all the lodgers there.

This occurrence led me into a new kind of error. I

began to think that these unhappy ones also could be helped. This, in my self-deception, it seemed to me would be very easily done. I said to myself, "Now we shall put down the names of these women too; and afterward, when we (though it never occurred to me to ask who were the *we*) have written everything down, we can occupy ourselves with their affairs." I imagined that *we*, the very persons who, during many generations, have been leading such women into such a condition, and still continue to do so, could one fine morning wake, and remedy it all. And yet, if I could have recollected my conversation with the lost woman who was nursing the baby for the sick mother, I should have understood all the folly of such an idea.

When we first saw this woman nursing the child, we thought that it was hers; but upon our asking her what she was, she answered us plainly that she was unmarried. She did not say "prostitute." It was left for the rude proprietor of the lodgings to make use of that terrible word. The supposition that she had a child gave me the idea of helping her out of her present position.

"Is this child yours?" I asked.

"No; it is that woman's there."

"Why do you nurse him?"

"She asked me to; she is dying."

Though my surmise turned out to be wrong, I continued to speak with her in the same spirit. I began to question her as to who she was, and how she came to be in such a position. She told me her story willingly, and very plainly. She belonged to the lower ranks of Moscow society, the daughter of a factory workman. She was left an orphan, and adopted by her aunt, from whose house she began to visit the inns. The aunt was now dead.

When I asked her whether she wished to change her course of life, my question did not even interest her. How can a supposition about something quite impossible awaken an interest in any one? She smiled, and said:—

"Who would take me with a yellow ticket?"

"But," said I, "if it were possible to find you a situation as a cook or something else?" I said this because she looked like a strong woman, with a kind, dull, round face, not unlike many cooks I had seen.

Evidently my words did not please her. She repeated, "Cook! but I do not understand how to bake bread."

She spoke jestingly; but, by the expression of her face, I saw that she was unwilling; that she even considered the position and rank of a cook beneath her.

This woman, who, in the most simple manner, like the widow in the gospel, had sacrificed all that she had for a sick person, at the same time, like other women of the same profession, considered the position of a workman or working-woman low and despicable. She had been educated in order to live without work,—a life which all her friends considered quite natural. This was her misfortune. And by this she came into her present position, and is kept in it. This brought her to the inns. Who of us men and women will cure her of this false view of life? Are there among us men convinced that a laborious life is more respectable than an idle one, and who are living according to this conviction, and who make this the test of their esteem and respect?

If I had thought about it, I should have understood that neither I nor anybody else I know was able to cure a person of this disease.

I should have understood that those wondering and awakened faces that looked over the partition expressed merely astonishment at the pity shown to them, but no wish to reform their lives. They did not see the immorality of them. They knew that they were despised and condemned, but the reason for it they could not understand. They had lived in this manner from their infancy among women like themselves, who, they know very well, have always existed, do exist, and are so necessary to society, that there are officials deputed by government to see that they conform to regulations.

Besides, they know that they have power over men, and subdue them, and often influence them more than any other women. They see that their position in society, notwithstanding the fact that they are always blamed, is recognized by men as well as by women and by the government; and therefore they cannot even understand of what they have to repent, and wherein they should reform.

During one of our visiting tours the student told me that, in one of the lodgings, there was a woman about to sell her daughter, thirteen years old. Wishing to save this little girl, I went on purpose to their lodging.

Mother and daughter were living in great poverty. The mother, a small, dark-complexioned prostitute of forty years of age, was not simply ugly, but disagreeably ugly. The daughter also was bad-looking. To all my indirect questions about their mode of life, the mother replied curtly, with a look of suspicion and animosity, apparently feeling that I was an enemy with bad intentions; the daughter said nothing without looking first at the mother, in whom she evidently had entire confidence.

They did not awaken pity in my heart, but rather disgust. But I decided that it was necessary, to save the daughter, to awaken an interest in ladies who might sympathize with the miserable condition of these women, and might so be brought here.

But if I had thought about the antecedents of the mother, how she had given birth to her daughter, how she had fed and educated her, certainly without any outside help, and with great sacrifices to herself; if I had thought of the view of life which had formed itself in her mind, — I should have understood that, in the mother's conduct, there was nothing at all bad or immoral, seeing she had been doing for her daughter all she could; *i.e.* what she considered best for herself.

It was possible to take this girl away from her mother by force; but to convince her that she was doing wrong in selling her daughter was not possible. It would first be necessary to save this woman — this mother — from

a condition of life approved by every one, and according to which a woman may live without marrying and without working, serving exclusively as a gratification to the passions. If I had thought about this, I should have understood that the majority of those ladies whom I wished to send here for the saving of this girl were not only themselves avoiding family duties, and leading idle and sensual lives, but were consciously educating their daughters for this very same mode of existence. One mother leads her daughter to the inn, and another to court and to balls. But the views of the world held by both mothers are the same; viz., that a woman must gratify the lusts of men, and for that she must be fed, dressed, and taken care of.

How, then, are our ladies to reform this woman and her daughter?

CHAPTER IX

STILL more strange were my dealings with the children. In my *rôle* as a benefactor, I paid attention to the children, too, wishing to save innocent beings from going to ruin in this den; and I wrote down their names in order to attend to them myself *afterward*.

Among these children, my attention was particularly drawn to Serozha, a boy twelve years old. I sincerely pitied this clever, intelligent lad, who had been living with a bootmaker, and who was left without any place of refuge when his master was put into prison. I wished to do something for him.

I will now give the result of my benevolence in his case, because this boy's story will show my false position as a benefactor better than anything else.

I took the boy into my house, and lodged him in the kitchen. Could I possibly bring a lousy boy out of a den of depravity to my children? I considered that I had been very kind in having put him where he was, amongst my servants. I thought myself a great benefactor for having given him some of my old clothes and

fed him, though it was properly my cook who did it, not I. The boy remained in my house about a week.

During this week I saw him twice, and, passing by him, spoke some words to him, and, when out walking, called on a bootmaker whom I knew, and proposed the boy as an apprentice. A peasant who was on a visit at my house invited him to go to his village and work in a family. The boy refused to accept it, and disappeared within a week.

I went to Rzhanoŭ's house to inquire after him. He had returned there, but when I called he was not at home. He had already been two days to the zoölogical gardens, where he hired himself for thirty kopeks a day to appear in a procession of savages in costume, leading an elephant. There was some public show on at the time.

I went to see him again, but he evidently avoided me. Had I reflected upon the life of this boy, and on my own, I should have understood that the boy had been spoiled by the fact of his having tasted the sweets of a merry and idle life, and that he had lost the habit of working. And I, in order to confer a benefit on him and reform him, took him into my own house; and what did he see there? He saw my children, some older than he, some younger, and some of the same age, who not only never did anything for themselves, but gave as much work to others as they could. They dirtied and spoiled everything about them, surfeited themselves with all sorts of dainties, broke the china, upset and threw to the dogs food which would have been a treat to him. If I took him out of a den and brought him to a respectable place, he could not but assimilate those views of life which existed there; and, according to these views, he understood that, in a respectable position, one must live without working, eat and drink well, and lead a merry life.

True, he did not know that my children had much labor in learning the exceptions in Latin and Greek grammars; and he would not have been able to understand the object of such work. But one cannot help seeing that, had he even understood it, the influence

upon him of the example of my children would have been still stronger. He would have then understood that they were being educated in such a way that, not working now, they might hereafter also work as little as possible, and enjoy the good things of life by virtue of their diplomas.

But what he did understand of it made him go, not to the peasant to take care of cattle and feed on potatoes and kvas, but to the zoölogical gardens in the costume of a savage to lead an elephant for thirty kopeks a day. I ought to have understood how foolish it was of one who was educating his own children in complete idleness and luxury, to try to reform other men and their children, and save them from going to ruin and idleness in what I called the *dens* in Rzhanoff's house; where, however, three-fourths of the men were working for themselves and for others. But then I understood nothing of all this.

In Rzhanoff's house, there were a great many children in the most miserable condition. There were children of prostitutes, orphans, and children carried about the streets by beggars. They were all very wretched. But my experience with Serozha showed me that, so long as I continued living the life which I did, I was not able to help them.

While the latter was living with us, I remember that I took pains to hide from him our way of life, particularly that of my children. I felt that all my endeavors to lead him to a good and laborious life were frustrated by my example and that of my children. It is very easy to take away a child from a prostitute or a beggar. It is very easy, when one has money, to wash him, dress him in new clothes, feed him well, and even teach him different accomplishments; but to teach him how to earn his living is, for us who have not been earning ours, but have been doing just the contrary, not only difficult, but quite impossible, because by our example, and by the very improvements of his mode of life effected by us, without any cost on our part, we teach him the very opposite.

You may take a puppy, pet him, feed him, teach him to carry things after you, and be pleased with looking at him; but it is not enough to feed a man, dress him, and teach him Greek; you must teach him how to live; *i.e.* how to take less from others, and give them more in return: and yet we cannot help teaching him the very opposite, through our own mode of life, whether we take him into our own house, or put him into a home to bring up.

CHAPTER X

I HAVE never since experienced such a feeling of compassion toward men, and of aversion toward myself, as I felt in Liapin's house. I was now filled with the desire to carry out the scheme which I had already begun, and to do good to those men whom I met with.

And, strange to say, though it might seem that to do good and to give money to those in want of it was a good deed, and ought to dispose men to universal love, it turned out quite the reverse; calling up in me bitter feeling, and a disposition to censure them. Even during our first visiting tour, a scene occurred similar to that in Liapin's house; but it failed to produce again the same effect, and created a very different impression.

It began with my finding in one of the lodgings a miserable person who required immediate help, — a woman who had not eaten food for two days.

It happened thus: In one very large and almost empty night lodging, I asked an old woman whether there were any poor people who had nothing to eat. She hesitated a moment, and then named two; then suddenly, as if recollecting herself, she said, "Yes, there lies one of them," pointing to a pallet. "This one," she added, "indeed, has nothing to eat."

"You don't say so! Who is she?"

"She has been a lost woman; but, as nobody takes her now, she can't earn anything. The landlady has

had pity on her, but now she wants to turn her out. — Agafia! I say, Agafia!" cried the old woman.

We went a little nearer, and saw something rise from the pallet. This was a gray-haired, disheveled woman, thin as a skeleton, in a dirty, torn chemise, and with peculiarly glittering, immovable eyes. She looked fixedly beyond us, tried to snatch up her jacket behind her in order to cover her bony chest, and growled out like a dog, "What? what?"

I asked her how she managed to live. For some time she was unable to see the drift of my words, and said, "I do not know myself; they are going to turn me out."

I asked again; and oh, how ashamed of myself I feel! my hand can scarcely write it! I asked her whether it was true that she was starving. She replied in the same feverish, excited manner, "I had nothing to eat yesterday; I have had nothing to eat to-day."

The miserable aspect of this woman impressed me deeply, but quite differently, from what those had in Liapin's house; there, out of pity for them, I felt embarrassed and ashamed of myself; but here, I rejoiced that I had, at last, found what I had been looking for, — a hungry being.

I gave her a ruble, and I remember how glad I felt that the others had seen it.

The old woman forthwith asked me also for money. It was so pleasant to me to give, that I handed her some also, without thinking whether it was necessary or not. She accompanied me to the door, and those who were in the corridor heard how she thanked me. Probably my questions about the poor provoked expectations, for some of the inmates began to follow us wherever we went.

Among those that begged, there were evidently drunkards, who gave me a most disagreeable impression; but, having once given to the old woman, I thought I had no right to refuse them, and I began to give away more. This only increased the number of applicants, and there was a stir throughout the whole lodging-house.

On the stairs and in the galleries, people appeared

dogging my steps. When I came out of the yard, a boy ran quickly down the stairs, pushing through the people. He did not notice me, and said hurriedly : —

“ He gave a ruble to Agafia ! ”

Having reached the ground, he, too, joined the crowd that was following me. I came out into the street. All sorts of people crowded round me, begging for money. Having given away all I had in coppers, I entered a shop and asked the proprietor to give me change for ten rubles.

And here a scene similar to that which took place in Liapin's house occurred. A dreadful confusion ensued. Old women, seedy gentlefolk, peasants, children, all crowded about the shop, stretching out their hands ; I gave, and asked some of them about their position and means, and entered all in my note-book. The shop-keeper, having turned up the fur collar of his greatcoat, was sitting like a statue, glancing now and then at the crowd, and again staring beyond it. He apparently felt, like every one else, that all this was very foolish, but he dared not say so.

In Liapin's house the misery and humiliation of the people had overwhelmed me ; and I felt myself to blame for it, and also felt the desire and the possibility of becoming a better man. But though the scene here was similar, it produced a quite different effect. In the first place, I felt angry with many of those who assailed me, and then I felt anxious as to what the shopmen and the dvorniks might think of me. I returned home that day with a weight on my mind. I knew that what I had done was foolish and inconsistent ; but, as usual, when my conscience was troubled, I talked the more about my projected plan, as if I had no doubt whatever as to its success.

The next day I went alone to those whom I had noted down, and who seemed the most miserable, thinking they could be more easily helped than others.

As I have already mentioned, I was not really able to help any of these people. It turned out that to do so was more difficult than I had imagined ; either I

did not understand how to do it, or else it was indeed impossible.

I went several times before the last visiting tour to Rzhanoff's house, and each time the same thing occurred: I was assailed by a crowd of men and women, in the midst of whom I utterly lost my presence of mind.

I felt the impossibility of doing anything because there were so many of them, and I was angry with them because they were so many; besides, each of them, taken separately, did not awaken any sympathy in me. I felt that each one of them lied, or at least prevaricated, and regarded me only as a purse out of which money could be abstracted. It often seemed to me that the very money which was extorted from me did not improve their position, but only made it worse.

The oftener I went to these houses, the closer the intercourse which I had with the inmates, the more apparent became the impossibility of doing anything; but, notwithstanding this, I did not give up my plan until after the last night tour with the census-takers.

I feel more ashamed of this visit than of any other. Formerly I had gone alone, but now twenty of us went together. At seven o'clock all those who wished to take part in this last tour began to assemble in my house. They were almost all strangers to me. Some students, an officer, and two of my fashionable acquaintances, who, after having repeated the usual phrase, "*C'est très intéressant!*" asked me to put them into the number of the census-takers.

These fashionable friends of mine had dressed themselves in shooting-jackets and high traveling-boots, which they thought more suited to the visit than their ordinary attire. They carried with them peculiar pocket-books and extraordinary-looking pencils. They were in that agitated state of mind which one experiences just before going to a hunt, or to a duel, or into a battle. The falseness and foolishness of our enterprise was now more apparent to me when looking at them; but were we not all in the same ridiculous position?

Before starting we had a conference, somewhat like a

council of war, as to what we should begin with, how to divide ourselves, and so on. This conference was just like all other official councils, meetings, and committees: each spoke, not because he had anything to say, or to ask, but because every one tried to find something to say in order not to be behind the rest. But during this conversation no one alluded to the acts of benevolence to which I had so many times referred; and however much ashamed I felt, I found it was needful to remind them that we must carry out our charitable intentions by writing down, during the visiting tour, the names of all whom we should find in a destitute condition.

I had always felt ashamed to speak about these matters; but here, in the midst of our hurried preparations for the expedition, I could scarcely utter a word about them. All listened to me and seemed touched, all agreed with me in words; but it was evident that each of them knew that it was folly, and that it would lead to nothing, so they began at once to talk about other subjects, and continued doing so until it was time for us to start.

We came to the dark tavern, aroused the waiters, and began to sort our papers. When we were told that the people, having heard about this visiting tour, had begun to leave their lodgings, we asked the landlord to shut the gate, and we ourselves went to the yard to persuade those to remain who wanted to escape, assuring them that no one would ask to see their tickets.

I remember the strange and painful impression produced upon me by these frightened night lodgers. Ragged and half-dressed, they all appeared tall to me by the light of the lantern in the dark courtyard. Frightened and horrible in their terror, they stood in a small knot round the pestilential outhouse, listening to our persuasions, but not believing us, and evidently, like hunted animals, were prepared to do anything to escape from us.

Gentlemen of all kinds, town and country policemen, public prosecutors and judges, had all their lives long been hunting them in towns and villages, on the roads and in

the streets, in the taverns and in the lodging-houses; and suddenly these gentlemen had come at night and shut the gate, only, forsooth, in order to count them: they found it as difficult to believe this as it would be for hares to believe that the dogs are come out not to catch but to count them.

But the gates were shut, and the frightened night lodgers returned to their respective places; and we, having separated into groups, began our visit. With me were my fashionable acquaintances and two students. Vanya, with a lantern, went before us in a greatcoat and white trousers, and we followed. We entered lodgings well known to me. The place was familiar, some of the persons also; but the majority were new to me, and the spectacle was also a new and dreadful one, — still more dreadful than that which I had seen at Liapin's house. All the lodgings were filled, all the pallets occupied, and not only by one, but often by two persons. The sight was dreadful, because of the closeness with which these people were huddled together, and because of the indiscriminate commingling of men and women. Such of the latter as were not dead drunk were sleeping with men. Many women with children slept with strange men on narrow beds.

The spectacle was dreadful, owing to the misery, dirt, raggedness, and terror of these people; and chiefly so because there were so many of them. One lodging, then another, then a third, a tenth, a twentieth, and so on, without end. And everywhere the same fearful stench, the same suffocating exhalation, the same confusion of sexes, men and women, drunk, or in a state of insensibility; the same terror, submissiveness, and guilt stamped on all faces, so that I felt deeply ashamed and grieved, as I had before at Liapin's. At last I understood that what I was about to do was disgusting, foolish, and therefore impossible; so I left off writing down their names and questioning them, knowing now that nothing would come of it.

At Liapin's I had been like a man who sees a horrible wound on the body of another. He feels sorry for

the man, ashamed of not having relieved him before, yet he can still hope to help the sufferer; but now I was like a doctor who comes with his own medicines to the patient, uncovers his wound only to mangle it, and to confess to himself that all he has done has been in vain, and that his remedy is ineffectual.

CHAPTER XI

THIS visit gave the last blow to my self-deception. It became very evident to me that my aim was not only foolish, but also productive of evil. And yet, though I knew this, it seemed to be my duty to continue my project a little longer: first, because by the article which I had written, and my visits, I had raised the expectations of the poor; secondly, because what I had said and written had awakened the sympathy of some benefactors, many of whom had promised to assist me personally and with money. And I was expecting to be applied to by both, and hoped to satisfy them as well as I was able.

As regards the applications made to me by those who were in need, the following details may be given. I received more than a hundred letters, which came exclusively from the "rich poor," if I may so express myself. Some of them I visited and some I left unanswered. In no instance did I succeed in doing any good. All the applications made to me were from persons who were once in a privileged position (I call such persons privileged who receive more from others than they give in return), had lost that position, and were desirous of regaining it. One wanted two hundred rubles in order to keep his business from going to ruin, and to enable him to finish the education of his children; another wanted to have a photographic establishment; a third wanted money to pay his debts, and take his best clothes out of pawn; a fourth was in need of a piano, in order to perfect himself, and earn money to support his family by giving lessons. The majority did not name any par-

ticular sum of money, they simply asked for help; but when I began to investigate what was necessary, it turned out that their wants increased in proportion to the help offered, and nothing satisfactory resulted. I repeat again, the fault may have been in my want of understanding; but in any case I helped no one, notwithstanding the fact that I made every effort to do so.

As for the philanthropists who were to coöperate with me, something very strange and quite unexpected occurred: of all who promised to assist with money, and even stated the amount they would give, not one contributed anything for distribution among the poor.

The promises of pecuniary assistance amounted to about three thousand rubles; but of all these people, not one recollected his agreement, or gave me a single kopek. The students alone gave the money which they received as payment for visiting, about twelve rubles; so that my scheme, which was to have collected tens of thousands of rubles from the rich, and to have saved hundreds and thousands of people from misery and vice, ended in my distributing at random some few rubles among those who came begging; and there remained on my hands the twelve rubles offered by the students, with twenty-five more sent me by the town-council for my labor as manager, which I positively did not know what to do with.

And so ended the affair.

Then, before leaving Moscow for the country, on the Sunday before the carnival I went to the Rzhanoﬀ house in the morning in order to distribute the thirty-seven rubles among the poor. I visited all whom I knew in the lodgings, but found only one invalid, to whom I gave something, — I think five rubles. There was nobody else to give to. Of course many began to beg; but, as I did not know them, I made up my mind to take the advice of Ivan Fedotitch, the tavern-keeper, respecting the distribution of the remaining thirty-two rubles.

It was the first day of the carnival. Everybody was smartly dressed, all had had food, and many were drunk.

In the yard near the corner of the house stood an old clothes man, dressed in a ragged peasant's coat and bark shoes. He was still hale and hearty. Sorting his purchases, he was putting them into different heaps, — leather, iron, and other things, — and was singing a merry song at the top of his voice.

I began to talk with him. He was seventy years of age; had no relatives; earned his living by dealing in old clothes, and not only did not complain, but said he had enough to eat, drink, and to spare. I asked him who in the place were particularly in want. He became cross, and said plainly that there was no one in want but drunkards and idlers; but on learning my object in asking, he begged of me five kopeks for drink, and ran to the tavern for it.

I also went to the tavern to see Ivan Fedotitch, in order to ask him to distribute the money for me. It was full; gayly dressed tipsy prostitutes were walking to and fro; all the tables were occupied; many people were already drunk; and in the small room some one was playing a harmonium, and two people were dancing. Ivan Fedotitch, out of respect for me, ordered them to leave off, and sat down next me at a vacant table. I asked him, as he knew his lodgers well, to point out those most in want, as I was intrusted with a little money for distribution, and wished him to direct me. The kind-hearted man (he died a year after), although he had to wait on his customers, gave me his attention for a time in order to oblige me. He began to think over it, and was evidently puzzled. One old waiter had overheard us, and took his part in the conference.

They began to go over his lodgers, some of whom were known to me, but they could not agree. "Paramonovna," suggested the waiter.

"Well, yes, she does go hungry sometimes; but she drinks."

"What difference does that make?"

"Well, Spiridon Ivanovitch, he has children; that's the man for you."

But Ivan Fedotitch had doubts about Spiridon too.

“Akulina; but she has a pension. Ah, but there is the blind man!”

To him I myself objected; I had just seen him. This was an old man of eighty years of age, without any relatives. One could scarcely imagine any condition to be worse; and yet I had just seen him lying drunk on a feather-bed, cursing at his comparatively young mistress in the most filthy language.

They then named a one-armed boy and his mother. I saw that Ivan Fedotitch was in great difficulty, owing to his conscientiousness, for he knew that everything given away by me would be spent at his tavern. But as I had to get rid of my thirty-two rubles, I insisted, and we managed somehow or other to distribute the money. Those who received it were mostly well-dressed, and we had not far to go to find them; they were all in the tavern.

Thus ended all my benevolent enterprises; and I left for the country, vexed with every one, as it always happens when one does something foolish and harmful. Nothing came of it all, except the train of thoughts and feelings which it called forth in me, which not only did not cease, but doubly agitated my mind.

CHAPTER XII

WHAT did it all mean?

I had lived in the country, and had entered into relations with the country poor. It is not out of false modesty, but in order to state the truth, which is necessary in order to understand the run of all my thoughts and feelings, that I must say that in the country I had done perhaps but little for the poor, the help which had been required of me was so small; but even the little I had done had been useful, and had formed round me an atmosphere of love and sympathy with my fellow-creatures, in the midst of whom it might yet be possible for me to quiet the gnawing of my conscience as to the unlawfulness of my life of luxury.

On going to the city I had hoped for the same happy relations with the poor, but there things were upon quite another footing. In the city, poverty was at once less truthful, more exacting, and more bitter than in the country. It was chiefly because there was so much more of it accumulated together, that it produced upon me a most harrowing impression. What I experienced at Liapin's house made my own luxurious life seem monstrously evil. I could not doubt the sincerity and the strength of this conviction; yet, notwithstanding this, I was quite incapable of carrying out that revolution which demanded an entire change in my mode of life: I was frightened at the prospect, and so I resorted to compromises. I accepted what I was told by every one, and what has been said by everybody since the world began, — that riches and luxury contain in themselves no evil, that they are given by God, and that it is possible to help those in need whilst continuing to live luxuriously. I believed this, and wanted to do so. And I wrote an article in which I called upon all rich people to help. These all admitted themselves morally obliged to agree with me, but evidently did not wish to, or could not, either do or give anything for the poor.

I then began visiting, and discovered what I had in no way expected to see. On the one hand, I saw in these dens (as I had at first called them) men whom it was impossible for me to help, because they were working-men, accustomed to labor and privation, and therefore having a much firmer hold on life than I had. On the other hand, I saw miserable men whom I could not aid because they were just such as I was myself. The majority of the poor whom I saw were wretched, merely because they had lost the capacity, desire, and habit of earning their bread; in other words, their misery consisted in the fact that they were just like myself. Whereas, of poor people, to whom it was possible to give immediate assistance, — those suffering from illness, cold, and hunger, — I found none, except the starving Agafia; and I became persuaded that, being so far removed from the life of those whom I wished to succor,

it was almost impossible to find such need as I sought, because all real need was attended to by those amongst whom these unhappy creatures lived: and my principal conviction now was that, with money, I could never reform that life of misery which these people led.

I was persuaded of this: yet a feeling of shame to leave off all I had begun, and self-deception as to my own virtues, made me continue my plan for some time longer, till it died a natural death; thus, only with great difficulty and the help of Ivan Fedotitch, I managed to distribute in the tavern at Rzhanoff's house the thirty-seven rubles which I considered were not my own.

Of course I might have continued this style of thing and have transformed it into a kind of charity, and, by importuning those who promised to give me money, I might have obtained and distributed more, thus comforting myself with the idea of my own excellence; but I became convinced on the one hand, that we rich people do not wish, and are also unable, to distribute to the poor a portion of our superfluities (we have so many wants ourselves), and that money should not be given to any one if we really wished to do good, and not merely to distribute it at random as I had done in the Rzhanoff tavern; so I dropped the affair entirely, and quitted Moscow, in despair, for my own village.

I intended on returning home to write a pamphlet on my experience, and to state why my project had not succeeded. I wanted to justify myself from the imputations which resulted from my article on the census; I wanted also to denounce society and its heartless indifference; and I desired to point out the causes of this town misery, and the necessity for endeavoring to remedy it, as well as those means which I thought were requisite for this purpose. I began even then to write, and fancied I had many very important facts to communicate. But in vain did I rack my brain: I could not manage it, notwithstanding the superabundance of material at my command, because of the irritation under which I wrote, and because I had not yet learned by experience what was necessary to grasp the question

rightly ; still more because I had not become fully conscious of the cause of it all, — a very simple cause, which was deep-rooted in myself ; so the pamphlet was not finished at the commencement of the present year (1884–1885). In the matter of moral law we witness a strange phenomenon to which men pay too little attention. If I speak to an unlearned man about geology, astronomy, history, natural philosophy, or mathematics, he receives the information as quite new to him, and never says to me, “There is nothing new in what you tell me ; every one knows it, and I have known it for a long time.”

But tell a man one of the highest moral truths in the simplest manner, in such a way as it has never been before formulated, and every ordinary man, particularly one who does not take any interest in moral questions, and, above all, one who dislikes them, is sure to say : “Who does not know that ? It has been always known and expressed.” And he really believes this. Only those who can appreciate moral truths know how to value their elucidation and simplification by a long and laborious process, or can prize the transition from a first vaguely understood proposition or desire to a firm and determined expression calling for a corresponding change of conduct.

We are all accustomed to consider moral doctrine to be a very insipid and dull affair, in which there cannot be anything new or interesting ; whereas, in reality, human life, with all its complicated and varied actions, which seem to have no connection with morals, — political activity, activity in the sciences, in the arts, and in commerce, — has no other object than to elucidate moral truths more and more, and to confirm, simplify, and make them accessible to all.

I recollect once while walking in a street in Moscow I saw a man come out and examine the flagstones attentively ; then, choosing one of them, he sat down by it and began to scrape or rub it vigorously.

“What is he doing with the pavement ?” I wondered ; and, having come up close to him, I discovered

he was a young man from a butcher's shop, and was sharpening his knife on the flagstone. He was not thinking about the stones when examining them, and still less while doing his work: he was merely sharpening his knife. It was necessary for him to do so in order to cut the meat, but to me it seemed that he was doing something to the pavement.

In the same way mankind seems to be occupied with commerce, treaties, wars, sciences, arts; and yet for them one thing only is important, and they do only that, — they are elucidating those moral laws by which they live.

Moral laws are already in existence, and mankind has been merely rediscovering them: this elucidation appears to be unimportant and imperceptible to one who has no need of moral law, and who does not desire to live by it. Yet this is not only the chief, but ought to be the sole, business of all men. This elucidation is imperceptible in the same way as the difference between a sharp knife and a blunt one is imperceptible. A knife remains a knife; and one who has not got to cut anything with it will not notice its edge; but for one who understands that all his life depends more or less upon whether his knife is blunt or sharp, every improvement in sharpening it is important; and such a man knows that there must be no limit to this improvement, and that the knife is only really a knife when it is sharp, and when it cuts what it has to cut.

The conviction of this truth flashed upon me when I began to write my pamphlet. Previously it seemed to me that I knew everything about my subject, that I had a thorough understanding of everything connected with those questions which had been awakened in me by the impressions made in Liapin's house during the census; but when I tried to sum them up, and to put them on paper, it turned out that the knife would not cut, and had to be sharpened; so it is only now after three years that I feel my knife is sharp enough for me to cut out what I want. It is not that I have learned new things: my thoughts are still the same; but they were

blunt formerly ; they kept scattering in every direction ; there was no edge to them ; nor was anything brought, as it is now, to one central point, to one most simple and plain conclusion.

CHAPTER XIII

I RECOLLECT that during the whole time of my unsuccessful endeavors to help the unfortunate inhabitants of Moscow, I felt that I was like a man trying to help others out of a morass, who was himself all the time stuck fast in it. Every effort made me feel the instability of that ground upon which I was standing. I was conscious that I myself was in this same morass ; but this acknowledgment did not help me to look more closely under my feet in order to ascertain the nature of the ground upon which I stood ; I kept looking for some exterior means to remedy the existing evil.

I felt then that my life was a bad one, and that people ought not to live so ; yet I did not come to the most natural and obvious conclusion that I must first reform my own mode of life before I should have any conception of how to reform that of others. And so I began, as it were, at the wrong end. I was living in town and I desired to improve the lives of the men there ; but I was soon convinced that I had no power to do so, and I began to ponder over the nature of town life and town misery.

I said to myself over and over : " What is this town life and town misery ? And why, while living in town, am I unable to help the town poor ? " The only reply I found was that I was powerless to do anything for them : first, because there were too many collected together in one place ; secondly, because none of them was at all like those in the country. And again I asked myself, " Why are there so many here, and in what do they differ from the country poor ? "

To both these questions the answer was one and the same. There are many poor people in towns because

there all those who have nothing to subsist on in the country are collected round the rich, and their peculiarity consists only in that they have all come into the towns from the country in order to get a living. (If there are any town poor born there, whose fathers and grandfathers were town born, these in their turn originally came there to get a living.) But what are we to understand by the expression, "getting a living in town"? There is something strange in the expression, it sounds like a joke when we reflect on its meaning. How is it that from the country — *i.e.* from places where there are woods, meadows, corn, and cattle, where the earth yields the treasures of fertility — men come away in order to get a living in a place where there are none of these advantages, but only stones and dust? What then do these words signify, to "get a living in town"?

Such a phrase is constantly used both by the employed and their employers, and that as if it were quite clear and intelligible. I remember now all the hundreds and thousands of town people living well or in want with whom I had spoken about their object in coming here; and all of them, without exception, told me they had quitted their villages in order to get a living; that, according to the proverb, "Moscow neither sows nor reaps, yet lives in wealth;" that in Moscow there is abundance of everything; and that, therefore, in Moscow one may get the money which is needed in the country for getting corn, cottages, horses, and the other essentials of life.

But, in fact, the source of all wealth is the country; there only are real riches, — corn, woods, horses, and everything necessary. Why then go to towns in order to get what is to be had in the country? And why should people carry away from the country into the towns such things as are necessary for country people, flour, oats, horses, and cattle?

Hundreds of times have I spoken thus with peasants who live in towns; and from my talks with them, and from my own observations, it became clear to me that

the accumulation of country people in our cities is partly necessary, because they could not otherwise earn their livelihood, and partly voluntary, because they are attracted by the temptations of a town life. It is true that the circumstances of a peasant are such that, in order to satisfy the pecuniary demands made on him in his village, he cannot do it otherwise than by selling that corn and cattle which he very well knows will be necessary for himself; and he is compelled, whether he will or not, to go to town in order to earn back that which was his own. But it is also true that he is attracted to town by the charms of a comparatively easy way of getting money and by the luxury of life there; and, under the pretext of thus earning his living, he goes there in order to have easier work and better eating, to drink tea three times a day, to dress himself smartly, and even to get drunk and lead a dissolute life.

The cause is a simple one, for property passing from the hands of the agriculturist into those of non-agriculturists thus accumulates in towns. Observe toward autumn how much wealth is gathered together in villages. Then come the demands of taxes, rents, recruiting; then the temptations of vodka, marriages, feasts, peddlers, and all sorts of other snares; so that in one way or other, this property, in all its various forms (sheep, calves, cows, horses, pigs, poultry, eggs, butter, hemp, flax, rye, oats, buckwheat, pease, hemp-seed, and flaxseed), passes into the hands of strangers, and is taken first to provincial towns and from them to the capitals. A villager is compelled to dispose of all these in order to satisfy the demands made upon him, and the temptations offered him, and, having thus dispensed his goods, he is left in want, and must follow where his wealth has been taken; and there he tries to earn back the money necessary for his most urgent needs at home; and so, being partly carried away by these temptations, he himself, along with others, makes use of the accumulated wealth.

Everywhere throughout Russia, and I think not only in Russia but all over the world, the same thing hap-

pens. The wealth of country producers passes into the hands of tradespeople, landowners, government functionaries, manufacturers; the men who receive this wealth want to enjoy it, and to enjoy it fully they must be in town. In the village, in the first place, owing to the inhabitants being scattered, it is difficult for the rich to gratify all their desires; you do not find there all sorts of shops, banks, restaurants, theaters, and various kinds of public amusements.

Secondly, another of the chief pleasures procured by wealth, — vanity, the desire to astonish, to make a display before others, — cannot be gratified in the country for the same reason, its inhabitants being too scattered. There is no one in the country to appreciate luxury; there is no one to astonish. There you may have what you like to embellish your dwelling, — pictures, bronze statues, all sorts of carriages, fine toilets, — but there is nobody to look at them or to envy you; the peasants do not understand the value of all this, and cannot make head or tail of it. Thirdly, luxury in the country is even disagreeable to a man who has a conscience, and is an anxiety to a timid person. One feels uneasy or ashamed at taking a milk bath, or in feeding puppies with milk, when there are children close by needing it; one feels the same in building pavilions and gardens among a people who live in cottages covered with stable litter, and who have no wood to burn. There is no one in the village to prevent the stupid, uneducated peasants from spoiling our comforts.

And, therefore, rich people gather together in towns, and settle near those who, in similar positions, have similar desires. In towns, the enjoyment of all sorts of luxuries is carefully protected by a numerous police. The chief inhabitants of the town are government functionaries, round whom all sorts of master workmen, artisans, and all the rich people have settled. There, a rich man has only to think about anything in order to get it. It is also more agreeable for him to live there, because he can gratify his vanity; there are people with whom he may try to compete in luxury,

whom he may astonish or eclipse. But it is especially pleasant for a wealthy man to live in town, because, where his country life was uncomfortable, and somewhat incongruous on account of his luxury, in town, on the contrary, it would be uncomfortable for him not to live splendidly, and as his equals in wealth do.

What seemed out of place there appears indispensable here. Rich people collect together in towns, and, under the protection of the authorities, peacefully enjoy all that has been brought there by the villagers. A countryman often cannot help going to town, where a ceaseless round of feasting is going on, where what has been procured from the peasants is being spent; he comes into the town in order to feed upon those crumbs which fall from the tables of the rich; and partly by observing the careless, luxurious, and universally approved mode of living of these men, he begins to desire to order his own affairs in such a manner that he, too, may be able to work less, and avail himself more of the labor of others. And at last he decides to settle down in the neighborhood of the wealthy, trying by every means in his power to get back from them what is necessary for him, and submitting to all the conditions which the rich enforce. These country people assist in gratifying all the fancies of the wealthy: they serve them in public baths, in taverns, as coachmen, and as prostitutes. They manufacture carriages, make toys and dresses, and little by little learn from their wealthy neighbors how to live like them, not by real labor, but by all sorts of tricks, squeezing out from others the money they have collected, and so become depraved, and are ruined. It is, then, this same population, depraved by the wealth of towns, which forms that city misery which I wished to relieve but could not.

And, indeed, if one only reflects upon the condition of these country folk, coming to town in order to earn money to buy bread or to pay taxes, seeing everywhere thousands of rubles foolishly squandered, and hundreds very easily earned, while they have to earn their pence by the hardest labor, one cannot but be astonished that

there are still many of such people at work, and that they do not all of them have recourse to a more easy way of getting money, — by trade, begging, vice, cheating, and even robbery.

But it is only we who join in the ceaseless orgy going on in the towns who can get so accustomed to our own mode of life that it seems quite natural to us for one fine gentleman to occupy five large rooms which are heated with such a quantity of firewood as would be enough for twenty families to warm their homes and cook their food with. To drive a short distance, we employ two thoroughbreds and two men; we cover our inlaid floors with carpets, and spend five or ten thousand rubles on a ball, or even twenty-five for a Christmas tree, and so on. Yet a man who needs ten rubles in order to buy bread for his family, or from whom his last sheep is taken to meet a tax of seven rubles which he cannot save by the hardest labor, cannot get accustomed to all this, which we imagine must seem quite natural to the poor; there are even such naïve people as say that the poor are thankful to us because we feed them by living so luxuriously.

But poor people do not lose their reasoning powers because they are poor: they reason quite in the same manner as we do. When we have heard that some one has lost a fortune at cards, or squandered ten or twenty thousand rubles, the first thought that comes into our minds is: How stupid and bad this man must be to have parted with such a large sum without any equivalent; and how well I could have employed this money for some building I have long wanted to get done, or for the improvement of my estate, and so on.

So also do the poor reason on seeing how foolishly we waste our wealth; all the more forcibly, because this money is needed, not to satisfy their whims, but for the chief necessities of life, of which they are in want. We are greatly mistaken in thinking that the poor, while able to reason thus, still look on unconcernedly at the luxury around them.

They have never acknowledged, and never will, that

it is right for one man to be always idling, and for another to be continually working. At first they are astonished at it and offended; then, looking closer into the question, they see that this order of things is acknowledged to be lawful, and they try themselves to get rid of working, and to take part in the feasting. Some succeed in so doing, and acquire similar wanton habits; others, little by little, approach such a condition; others break down before they reach their object, and, having lost the habit of working, fill the night houses and the haunts of vice.

The year before last we took from the village a young peasant to be our butler's assistant. He could not agree with the footman, and was sent away; he entered the service of a merchant, pleased his masters, and now wears a watch and chain, and has smart boots.

In his place we took another peasant, a married man. He turned out a drunkard, and lost money. We took a third; he began to drink, and, having drunk up all he had, was for a long time in distress in a night lodging-house. Our old cook took to drinking in the town, and fell ill. Last year a footman who used formerly to have fits of drunkenness, and who when in the village kept himself from it for five years, when living in Moscow without his wife, who used to keep him in order, began again to drink, and ruined himself. A young boy of our village is living as butler's assistant at my brother's. His grandfather, a blind old man, came to me while I was living in the country, and asked me to persuade this grandson to send ten rubles for taxes, because, unless this were done, the cow would have to be sold.

"He keeps telling me that he has to dress himself respectably," said the old man. "He got himself boots, and that ought to be enough; but I actually believe he would like to buy a watch!"

In these words the grandfather expressed the utmost degree of extravagance. And this was really so; for the old man could not afford a drop of oil for his food during the whole of Lent, and his wood was spoilt because he had not the ruble and a quarter necessary for cutting it up. But the old man's irony turned out to be a reality.

His grandson came to me dressed in a fine black overcoat, and in boots for which he had paid eight rubles. Lately he got ten rubles from my brother, and spent them on his boots. And my children, who have known the boy from his infancy, told me that he really considers it necessary to buy a watch. He is a very good boy, but he considers that he will be laughed at for not having one.

This year a housemaid, eighteen years of age, formed an intimacy with the coachman, and was sent away. Our old nurse, to whom I related the case, reminded me of a girl whom I had quite forgotten. Ten years ago, during our short stay in Moscow, she formed an intimacy with a footman. She was also sent away, and drifted at last into a house of ill fame, and died in a hospital before she was twenty years of age.

We have only to look around us in order to become terrified by that infection which (to say nothing of manufactories and workshops existing only to gratify our luxury) we directly, by our luxurious town life, spread among those very people whom we desire afterward to help.

Thus, having got at the root of that town misery which I was not able to alleviate, I saw that its first cause is in our taking from the villagers their necessities and carrying them to town. The second cause is that in those towns we avail ourselves of what we have gathered from the country, and, by our foolish luxury, tempt and deprave those peasants who follow us there in order to get back something of what we have taken from them in the country.

CHAPTER XIV

FROM an opposite point of view to that previously stated, I again came to the same conclusion. Recollecting all my connection with the town poor during this period, I saw that one reason why I was not able to help them was their insincerity and falseness. They all con-

sidered me, not as an individual, but merely as a means to an end. I felt I could not become intimate with them, I thought I did not perhaps understand how to do so; but without truthfulness no help was possible. How can one help a man who does not tell all his circumstances? Formerly I accused the poor of this, — it is so natural to accuse others; but one word spoken by a remarkable man, namely, Sutaief, who was then on a visit at my house, cleared up the difficulty, and showed me wherein lay the cause of my non-success.

I remember that even then what he said made a deep impression upon me; but I did not understand its full meaning until afterward. It happened that, while in the full ardor of my self-deception, I was at my sister's house, Sutaief being also there; and my sister was questioning me about my work.

I was relating it to her; and, as is often the case when one does not fully believe in one's own enterprises, I related with great enthusiasm, ardor, and at full length, all I had been doing, and all the possible results. I was telling her how we should keep our eyes open to what went on in Moscow; how we should take care of orphans and old people; how we should afford means to impoverished villagers to return to their homes, and pave the way to reform the depraved. I explained that, if we succeeded in our undertaking, there would not be in Moscow a single poor man who could not find help.

My sister sympathized with me; and while speaking I kept looking now and then at Sutaief, knowing his Christian life, and the importance attached by him to works of charity. I expected sympathy from him, and I spoke so that he might understand me; for, though I was addressing my sister, yet my conversation was really more directed to him.

He sat immovable, dressed in his black-tanned sheep-skin coat, which he, like other peasants, wore indoors as well as out. It seemed that he was not listening to us, but was thinking about something else. His small eyes gave no responding gleam, but seemed to be turned inward. Having spoken out to my own satisfac-

tion, I turned to him and asked him what he thought about it.

"The whole thing is superficial," he replied.

"Why?"

"The plan is an empty one, and no good will come of it," he repeated with conviction.

"How is it that nothing will come of it? Why is it a useless business, if we help thousands, or even hundreds, of unhappy ones? Is it a bad thing, according to the gospel, to clothe the naked, or to feed the hungry?"

"I know, I know; but what you are doing is not that. Is it possible to help thus? You are walking in the street; somebody asks you for a few kopeks; you give it him. Is that charity? Do him some spiritual good: teach him. What you gave him merely says, 'Leave me alone.'"

"No; but that is not what we were speaking of: we wish to become acquainted with the wants, and then help by money and by deeds. We will try to find for the poor people some work to do."

"That would be no way of helping them."

"How then? must they be left to die of starvation and cold?"

"Why left to die? How many are there of them?"

"How many?" said I, thinking that he took the matter so lightly from not knowing the great number of these men.

"You are not aware, I dare say, that there are in Moscow about twenty thousand cold and hungry. And then, think of those in St. Petersburg and other towns!"

He smiled.

"Twenty thousand! And how many families are there in Russia alone? Would they amount to a million?"

"Well, but what of that?"

"What of that?" said he, with animation, and his eyes sparkled. "Let us unite them with ourselves; I am not rich myself, but will at once take two of them. You take a young fellow into your kitchen; I invite him into my family. If there were ten times as many, we should

take them all into our families. You one, I another. We shall work together; those I take to live with me will see how I work; I will teach them to reap, and we shall eat out of one bowl, at one table; and they will hear a good word from me, and from you also. This is charity; but all this plan of yours is no good."

These plain words made an impression upon me. I could not help recognizing that this was true; but it seemed to me then that, notwithstanding the justice of what he said, my proposed plan might, perhaps, also be useful.

But the longer I was occupied with this affair, and the closer my intercourse with the poor, the oftener I recollected these words, and the greater meaning I found in them.

I, indeed, go in an expensive fur coat, or drive in my own carriage, to a man who is in want of boots: he sees my house which costs two hundred rubles a month, or he notices that I give away, without thinking, five rubles, only because such is my fancy; he is then aware that, if I give away rubles in such a manner, it is because I have accumulated so many of them that I have a lot to spare, which I not only am never in the habit of giving to any one, but which I have, without compunction, taken away from others. What can he see in me but one of those persons who have become possessed of what should belong to him? And what other feeling can he have toward me but the desire to get back as many as possible of these rubles which were taken by me from him and from others?

I should like to become intimate with him, and I complain that he is not sincere; but I am afraid to sit down upon his bed for fear of lice or some infectious disease; I am also afraid to let him come into my room; and when he comes to me half-dressed, he has to wait,—if fortunate, in the entrance-hall, but oftener in the cold porch. And then I say that it is all his fault that I cannot become intimate with him, and that he is not sincere.

Let the most hard-hearted man sit down to dine upon five courses among hungry people who have little or

nothing to eat except black bread, and no one could have the heart to eat while hungry people are around him licking their lips.

Therefore, in order to eat well, when living among half-starving men, the first thing necessary is to hide ourselves from them, and to eat so that they may not see us. This is the very thing we do at present.

Without predjudice I looked into our own mode of life, and became aware that it was not by chance that closer intercourse with the poor is difficult for us, but that we ourselves are intentionally ordering our lives in such a way as to make this intercourse impossible. And not only this; but, on looking at our lives, or at the lives of rich people, from without, I saw that all that is considered as the *summum bonum* of these lives consists in being separated as much as possible from the poor, or is in some way or other connected with this desired separation.

In fact, all the aim of our lives, beginning with food, dress, dwelling, cleanliness, and ending with our education, consists in placing a gulf between us and them. And in order to establish this distinction and separation we spend nine-tenths of our wealth in erecting impassable barriers.

The first thing a man does who has grown rich is to leave off eating with others out of one bowl. He arranges plates for himself and his family, and separates himself from the kitchen and the servants. He feeds his servants well, in order that their mouths may not water, and he dines alone. But eating alone is dull. He invents whatever he can to improve his food, embellish his table; and the very manner of taking food, as at dinner-parties, becomes for him a matter of vanity, of pride. His manner of eating his food is a means of separating himself from other people. For a rich man it is out of the question to invite a poor person to his table. One must know how to hand a lady to table, how to bow, how to sit, to eat, to use a finger-bowl, all of which the rich alone know how to do.

The same holds good with dress.

If a rich man, in order to cover his body and protect it from cold, wore ordinary dress—a jacket, a fur coat, felt shoes, leather boots, an undercoat, trousers, a shirt,—he would require very little; and, having two fur coats, he could not help giving one away to somebody who had none. But the wealthy man begins with wearing clothes which consist of many separate parts, and can be of use only on particular occasions, and therefore are of no use for a poor man. The man of fashion must have evening dress-coats, waistcoats, frock-coats, patent-leather shoes; his wife, bodices and dresses (which, according to fashion, are made of many parts), high-heeled shoes, hunting and traveling jackets, and so on. All these articles can be of use only to people in a condition far removed from poverty.

And thus dressing also becomes a means of isolation. Fashions make their appearance, and are among the chief things which separate the rich man from the poor one.

The same thing shows itself more plainly still in our dwellings. In order for one person to occupy ten rooms, we must manage so that he may not be seen by people who are living by tens in one room.

The richer a man is, the more difficult it is to get at him; the more footmen there are between him and people not rich, the more impossible it is for him to receive a poor guest, to let him walk on carpets, and sit on satin-covered chairs.

The same thing happens in traveling. A peasant who drives in a cart or on a carrier's sledge must be very hard-hearted if he refuses to give a pedestrian a lift; he has enough room, and can do it. But the richer the carriage is, the more impossible it is to put any one in it besides the owner of it. Some of the most elegant carriages are so narrow as to be termed "*egotists*."

The same thing applies to all the modes of living expressed by the word "cleanliness." Cleanliness! Who does not know human beings, especially women, who make a great virtue of cleanliness? Who does not

know the various phases of this cleanliness, which have no limit whatever when it is procured by the labor of others? Who among self-made men has not experienced in his own person with what pains he carefully accustomed himself to this cleanliness, which illustrates the saying, "White hands are fond of another's labor"?

To-day cleanliness consists in changing one's shirt daily, and to-morrow it will be changed twice a day. At first, one has to wash one's hands and neck every day, then one will have to wash one's feet every day, and afterward it will be the whole body, and in peculiar methods. A clean table-cloth serves for two days, then it is changed every day, and afterward two table-cloths a day are used. To-day the footman is required to have clean hands; to-morrow he must wear gloves, and clean gloves, and he must hand the letters on a clean tray.

And there are no limits to this cleanliness, which is of no other use to any one except to separate us from others, and to make our intercourse with them impossible, while cleanliness is obtained through the labor of others.

Not only so; but when I had deeply reflected upon this, I came to the conclusion that what we term education is a similar thing. Language cannot deceive; it gives the right appellation to everything. The common people call education fashionable dress, smart conversation, white hands, and a certain degree of cleanliness. Of such a man they say, when distinguishing him from others, that he is an educated man.

In a little higher circle, men by education denote the same things, but add playing on the piano, the knowledge of French, good Russian spelling, and still greater cleanliness.

In the still higher circle, education consists of all this, with the addition of English, and a diploma from a high government establishment, and a still greater degree of cleanliness. But in all these shades education is in substance quite the same.

It consists in those forms and various kinds of infor

mation which separate a man from his fellow-creatures. Its object is the same as that of cleanliness : to separate us from the crowd, in order that they, hungry and cold, may not see how we feast. But it is impossible to hide ourselves, and our efforts are seen through.

And so I became aware that the cause of the impossibility for us rich men to help the town poor was nothing more or less than the impossibility of our having closer intercourse with them, and that this we ourselves create by our whole life, and by all the uses we make of our wealth. I became persuaded that between us rich men and the poor there stood, erected by ourselves, a barrier of cleanliness and education which arose out of our wealth, and that, in order to be able to help them, we have first to break down this barrier, and render possible the realization of the means suggested by Sutaief, to take the poor into our respective homes. And so, as I have already said at the beginning of this chapter, I came to the same conclusion from a different point of view from that to which the train of thought about town misery had led me ; viz., the cause of it all lay in our wealth.

and I

CHAPTER XV

I BEGAN to analyze the matter from a third and purely personal point of view. Among the phenomena which particularly impressed me during my benevolent activity, there was one, — a very strange one, — which I could not understand for a long time.

Whenever I happened, in the street or at home, to give a poor person a trifling sum without entering into conversation with him, I saw, or imagined I saw, on his face an expression of pleasure and gratitude ; and I myself experienced an agreeable feeling at this form of charity. I saw that I had done what was expected of me. But when I stopped and began to question the man about his past and present life, entering more or less into particulars, I felt it was impossible to give him any-

thing; and I always began to finger the money in my purse, and, not knowing how much to give, I always gave more under these circumstances; but, nevertheless, I saw that the poor man went away from me dissatisfied. When I entered into still closer intercourse with him, my doubts as to how much I should give increased; and, no matter what I gave, the recipient seemed more and more gloomy and dissatisfied.

As a general rule, it almost always happened that if, upon nearer acquaintance with the poor man, I gave him three rubles or more, I always saw gloominess, dissatisfaction, and even anger depicted on his face; and sometimes, after having received from me ten rubles, he has left me without even thanking me, as if I had offended him.

In such cases I was always uncomfortable and ashamed, and felt myself guilty. When I watched the poor person during weeks, months, or years, helped him, and expressed my views, and became intimate with him, then our intercourse became a torment, and I saw that the man despised me. And I felt that he was right in doing so. When in the street a beggar asks me, along with other passers-by, for three kopeks, and I give it him, then, in his estimation, I am a kind and good man who gives "one of the threads which go to make the shirt of a naked one;" he expects nothing more than a thread, and, if I give it, he sincerely blesses me.

But if I stop and speak to him as man to man, show him that I wish to be more than a mere passer-by, and, as it often happened, he sheds tears in relating his misfortune, then he sees in me not merely a chance helper, but that which I wish him to see, — a kind man. If I am a kind man, then my kindness cannot stop at twenty kopeks, or at ten rubles, or ten thousand. One cannot be a second-rate kind man. Let us suppose that I give him much: that I put him straight, dress him, set him on his legs so that he can help himself, but, from some reason or other, either from an accident or his own weakness, he again loses the greatcoat and clothing and money I gave him, he is again hungry and cold, and he again

comes to me, why should I refuse him assistance? For if the end of my benevolent activity was merely the attainment of some definite, material object, such as giving him so many rubles, or a certain greatcoat, having given them I could be easy in my mind: but the end I have in view is to be a benevolent man; that is, to put myself in the position of every other man. All understand kindness thus, and not otherwise.

And therefore, if such a man should spend in drink all you gave him twenty times over, and be again hungry and cold, then, if you are a benevolent man, you cannot help giving him more money, you can never leave off doing so while you have more than he has; but if you draw back, you show that all you have done before was done by you not because you are benevolent, but because you wish to appear so to others and to him. And it was from my having to back out of such cases, and by ceasing to give, by seeming to put a limit to my kindness, that I felt a painful sense of shame.

What was this feeling, then? I had experienced it in Liapin's house and in the country, and when I happened to give money or anything else to the poor, and in my adventures among the town people. One case which occurred to me lately reminded me of it forcibly, and led me to discover its cause.

It happened in the country. I wanted twenty kopeks to give to a pilgrim. I sent my son to borrow it from somebody. He brought it to the man, and told me that he had borrowed it from the cook. Some days after other pilgrims came, and I was again in need of twenty kopeks. I had a ruble. I recollected what I owed the cook, went into the kitchen, hoping that he would have some more coppers. I said:—

“I owe you twenty kopeks; here is a ruble.”

I had not yet done speaking when the cook called his wife from the adjoining room: “Parasha, take it,” he said.

I, thinking she had understood what I wanted, gave her the ruble. I must tell you that the cook had been living at our house about a week, and I had seen his

wife, but had never spoken to her. I just wished to tell her to give me the change, when she briskly bowed herself over my hand, and was about to kiss it, evidently thinking I was giving her the ruble. I stammered out something, and left the kitchen. I felt ashamed, painfully ashamed, as I had not felt for a long time. I actually trembled, and felt that I was making a wry face; and, groaning with shame, I ran away from the kitchen.

This feeling, which I fancied I had not deserved, and which came over me quite unexpectedly, impressed me particularly, because it was so long since I had felt anything like it, and also because I fancied that I had been living in a way there was no reason for me to be ashamed of.

This surprised me greatly. I related the case to my family, to my acquaintances, and they all agreed that they also would have experienced the same. And I began to reflect; why is it that I felt so?

The answer came from a case which had formerly occurred to me in Moscow. I reflected upon it, and understood this shame which I have always experienced when I happen to give anything besides a trifling alms to beggars and pilgrims, which I am accustomed to give, and which I consider not as charity, but politeness.

If a man asks you for a light, you must light a match if you have it. If a man begs for three or twenty kopeks, or a few rubles, you must give if you have them. It is a question of politeness, not of charity.

The following is the case I referred to. I have already spoken about two peasants with whom I sawed wood three years ago. One Saturday evening, in the twilight, I was walking with them back to town. They were going to their master to receive their wages. On crossing a bridge we met an old man. He begged, and I gave him twenty kopeks. I gave, thinking what a good impression my alms would make upon Semyon, with whom I had been speaking on religious questions.

Semyon, a peasant from the province of Vladimir, who had a wife and two children in Moscow, also turned up the lappet of his kaftan, and took out his purse; and,

after having looked over his money, he picked out a three-kopek piece, gave it to the old man, and asked for two kopeks back. The old man showed him in his hand two three-kopek pieces and a single kopek. Semyon looked at it, was about to take one kopek, but, changing his mind, took off his cap, crossed himself, and went away, leaving the old man the three-kopek piece.

I was acquainted with all Semyon's pecuniary circumstances. He had neither house nor other property. When he gave the old man the three kopeks he possessed six rubles and fifty kopeks, which he had been saving up, and this was all the capital he had.

My property amounted to about six hundred thousand rubles. I had a wife and children, so also had Semyon. He was younger than I, and had not so many children; but his children were young, and two of mine were grown-up men, old enough to work, so that our circumstances, independently of our property, were alike, though I was in this respect even better off than he.

He gave three kopeks, I gave twenty. What was, then, the difference in our gifts? What should I have given in order to do as he had done? He had six hundred kopeks; out of these he gave one, and then another two. I had six hundred thousand rubles. In order to give as much as Semyon gave, I ought to have given three thousand rubles, and asked the man to give me back two thousand; and, in the event of his not having change, to leave him these two thousand also, cross myself, and go away calmly, conversing about how people live in the manufactories, and what is the price of liver at the Smolensk market.

I thought about this at the time, but it was long before I was able to draw from this case the conclusion which inevitably follows from it. This conclusion seems to be so uncommon and strange, notwithstanding its mathematical accuracy, that it requires time in order to get accustomed to it. I could not help thinking there was some mistake in it, but there is none. It is only the dreadful darkness of prejudice in which we live.

This, when I arrived at it and recognized its inevita-

bleness, explained to me the nature of my feelings of shame in the presence of the cook's wife, and before all the poor to whom I gave, and still give, money. Indeed, what is that money which I give to the poor, and which the cook's wife thought I was giving her? In the majority of cases it forms such a minute part of my income that it cannot be expressed in a fraction comprehensible to Semyon or to a cook's wife,—it is in most cases a millionth part or thereabout. I give so little that my gift is not, and cannot be, a sacrifice to me; it is only a something with which I amuse myself when and how it pleases me. And this was indeed how my cook's wife had understood me. If I gave a stranger in the street a ruble or twenty kopeks, why should I not give her also a ruble? For her, such a distribution of money was the same thing as a gentleman throwing gingerbread nuts into a crowd. It is the amusement of people who possess much "fool's money." I was ashamed, because the mistake of the cook's wife showed me plainly what ideas she and all poor people must have of me. "He is throwing away a 'fool's money';" that is, money not earned by him.

And, indeed, what is my money, and how did I come by it? One part of it I collected in the shape of rent for my land, which I had inherited from my father. The peasant sold his last sheep or cow in order to pay it to me.

Another part of my money I received for the books I had written. If my books are harmful, and yet sell, they can only do so by some seductive attraction, and the money which I receive for them is badly earned money; but if my books are useful, the thing is still worse. I do not give them to people, but say, "Give me so many rubles, and I will sell them to you."

And as in the former case a peasant sells his last sheep, here a poor student or a teacher does it; each poor person who buys denies himself some necessary thing in order to give me this money. And now I have gathered much of such money, and what am I doing with it? I take it to town, give it to the poor only

when they satisfy all my fancies, and come to town to clean pavements, lamps, or boots, to work for me in the factories, and so on. And with this money I draw from them all I can. I try to give them as little as I can, and take from them as much as possible.

And now, quite unexpectedly, I begin to share all this said money with these same poor persons for nothing, but not indiscriminately, only as fancy prompts me.

Why should not every poor man expect that his turn might come to-day to be one of such with whom I amuse myself by giving them my "fool's money"?

Thus every one regards me as did the cook's wife. And I had gone astray with the notion that this was charity, — this taking away thousands with one hand, and throwing kopeks with the other to those I select.

No wonder I was ashamed. But, before beginning to do good, I must leave off the evil, and put myself in a position in which I should cease to cause it. But all my course of life is evil. If I were to give away a hundred thousand, I have not yet put myself in a condition in which I could do good, because I have still five hundred thousand left.

It is only when I possess nothing at all that I shall be able to do a little good; such as, for instance, the poor prostitute did who nursed a sick woman and her child for three days. Yet this seemed to me to be but so little! And I ventured to think of doing good! One thing only was true, which I at first felt on seeing the hungry and cold people outside Liapin's house, — that I was guilty of that; and that to live as I did was impossible, utterly impossible. This alone was true. But what was to be done? This question, for any one interested, I will answer with full particulars, if God permit me, in the following chapters.

CHAPTER XVI

It was difficult for me at last to own this; but when I did get thus far, I was terrified at the delusion in which I had been living. I had been head over ears in the mud, and I had been trying to drag others out of it.

What is it that I really want? I want to do good; I want to so contrive that no human beings should be hungry and cold, and that men may live as it is proper for them to live. I desire this; and I see that in consequence of all sorts of violence, extortions, and various expedients in which I too took part, the working-people are deprived of the necessary things, and the non-working community, to whom I also belong, monopolize the labor of others. I see that this use of other people's labor is distributed thus: that the more cunning and complicated the tricks employed by the man himself (or by those from whom he has inherited his property), the more largely he employs the labors of other people, and the less he works himself.

First come the millionaires; then the wealthy bankers, merchants, landowners, government functionaries; then the smaller bankers, merchants, government functionaries, landowners, to whom I belong; then shopmen, publicans, usurers, police sergeants and inspectors, teachers, sacristans, clerks; then, again, house-porters, footmen, coachmen, water-carters, cabmen, peddlers; and then, last of all, the workmen, factory hands and peasants, the number of this class in proportion to the former being as ten to one.

I see that the lives of nine-tenths of the working-people essentially require exertion and labor like every other natural mode of living; but that, in consequence of the tricks by which the necessities of life are taken away from these people, their lives become every year more difficult, and more beset with privations; and our lives, the lives of the non-laboring community, owing to the coöperation of sciences and arts, which have this

very end in view, become every year more sumptuous, more attractive and secure.

I see that in our days the life of a laboring-man, and especially the lives of old people, women, and children, of the working-classes, are quite worn away by increased labor, not in proportion to their nourishment, and that even the very first necessities of life are not secured to them. I see that side by side with these the lives of the non-laboring class, to which I belong, are each year more and more filled up with superfluities and luxury, and are becoming continually more secure; the lives of the wealthy have attained to that degree of security of which in olden times men dreamed only in fairy-tales,—to the condition of the owner of the magic purse with an “inexhaustible ruble”; to such a state when a man not only is entirely free from the law of labor for the sustenance of his life, but has the possibility of enjoying without working all the goods of this life, and of bequeathing to his children, or to any he chooses, this purse with the “inexhaustible ruble.”

I see that the productions of the labor of men pass over more than ever from the masses of laborers to those of non-laborers; that the pyramid of the social structure is, as it were, being rebuilt, so that the stones of the foundation pass to the top, and the rapidity of this passage increases in a kind of geometric progression.

I see that there is going on something like that which would have taken place in an ant-hill, if the society of ants should have lost the sense of the general law, and some of the ants were to take the productions of labor out of the foundations and carry them to the top of the hill, making the foundation narrower and narrower, thus enlarging the top, and by that means making their fellows pass also from the foundation to the top.

I see that, instead of an ideal, as exemplified in a laborious life, men have created the ideal of a purse with an “inexhaustible ruble.” The rich, I among their number, arrange this ruble for ourselves by various artifices; and, in order to enjoy it, we locate ourselves in towns, in

a place where nothing is produced, but everything is swallowed up.

The poor laboring-man, swindled in order that the rich may have this magic ruble, follows them to town; and there he also has recourse to artifices, either arranging matters so that he may work little and enjoy much, thus making the condition of working-men still more heavy, or, not having attained to this state, he ruins himself, and drifts into the continually and rapidly increasing number of hungry and cold tenants of night houses.

I belong to the category of those men who, by the means of these various devices, take away from the working-people the necessities of life, and who thus create, as it were, for themselves the inexhaustible fairy ruble, which tempts in turn these unfortunate ones.

I wish to help men; and therefore it is clear that, first of all, I ought on the one side to cease to plunder them as I am doing now, and, on the other, I must leave off tempting them. But I, by means of most complicated, cunning, and wicked contrivances practised for centuries, have made myself the owner of this said ruble; that is, have got into such a condition that I may, while never doing anything myself, compel hundreds and thousands of people to work for me, and am really availing myself of this privileged monopoly, notwithstanding that all the time I imagine I pity these men, and wish to help them.

It is as if I were sitting on the neck of a man, and, having quite crushed him down, I compel him to carry me, and will not alight from off his shoulders, while I assure myself and others that I am very sorry for him, and wish to ease his condition by every means in my power except by getting off his back.

Surely this is plain. If I wish to help the poor, that is, to make the poor cease to be poor, I ought not to create these same poor. Yet I give money according to my fancy to those who have gone astray, and take away tens of rubles from men who have not yet done so, thereby making them poor, and at the same time making them depraved.

This is very clear; but at first it was for me exceedingly difficult to understand, without any modification or reserve which would justify my position. However, as soon as I came to see my own error, all that formerly appeared strange, complicated, clouded, and inexplicable, became quite simple and intelligible to me; and the line of conduct which ensued became both clear and satisfactory to my conscience by the following considerations.

Who am I that I desire to better men's condition? I desire it; and yet I get up at noon, after having played at cards in a brilliantly lighted saloon during all the previous night, I, an enfeebled and effeminate man, who thus require the help and services of hundreds of people, I come to help them!—these men who rise at five, sleep on boards, feed upon cabbage and bread, understand how to plow, to reap, to put a handle to an ax, to write, to harness horses, to sew; men who, by their strength and perseverance and self-restraint, are a hundred times stronger than I who come to help them.

What could I have experienced in my intercourse with these people but shame? The weakest of them—a drunkard, an inhabitant of Rzhanoﬀ's house, he whom they call “the sluggard”—is a hundred times more laborious than I—his balance, so to say,—in other words, the relation between what he takes from men and what he gives them,—is a thousand times more to his credit than mine when I count what I receive from others, and what I give them in return. And to such men I go in order to assist them.

I go to help the poor. But of the two, who is the poorer? No one is poorer than myself. I am a weak, good-for-nothing parasite, who can only exist in very peculiar conditions, who can live only when thousands of people labor to support this life which is not useful to any one. And I, this very caterpillar which eats up the leaves of a tree, wish to help the growth and the health of the tree, and to cure it.

All my life is thus spent: I eat, talk, and listen; then I eat, write, or read, which are only talking and

listening in another form ; I eat again, and play ; then eat, talk, and listen, and finally eat and go to sleep ; and thus every day is spent ; I neither do anything else, nor understand how to do it. And in order that I may enjoy this life, it is necessary that from morning till night house-porters, dvorniks, cooks, male and female, footmen, coachmen, and laundresses should work, to say nothing of the manual labor necessary in order that the coachmen, cooks, footmen, and others may have the instruments and the articles by which, and upon which, they work for me, — axes, casks, brushes, dishes, furniture, glasses, wax, shoe-black, kerosene, hay, wood, and food. And all these men and women work hard all the day, and every day, in order that I may talk, eat, and sleep.

And I, this useless man, imagined that I was able to benefit others, they being the very same people who were serving me. That I did not benefit any one, and that I was ashamed of myself, is not so astonishing as the fact that such a foolish idea ever came into my mind.

The woman who nursed the sick old man helped him ; the peasant's wife, who cut a slice of her bread, earned by her from the very sowing of the corn that made it, helped the hungry one ; Semyon, who gave three kopeks which he had earned, assisted the pilgrim, because these three kopeks really represented his labor ; but I had served nobody, worked for no one, and knew very well that my money did not represent my labor. And so I felt that in money, or in money's worth, and in the possession of it, there was something wrong and evil ; that the money itself, and the fact of my having it, was one of the chief causes of those evils which I had seen before me, and I asked myself, What is money ?

CHAPTER XVII

MONEY ! What, then, is money ?

It is answered, money represents labor. I meet educated people who even assert that money represents

labor performed by those who possess it. I confess that I myself formerly shared this opinion, although I did not very clearly understand it. But now it became necessary for me to learn thoroughly what money was.

In order to do so, I addressed myself to science. Science says that money in itself is neither unjust nor pernicious; that money is the natural result of the conditions of social life, and is indispensable, first, for convenience of exchange; secondly, as a measure of value; thirdly, for saving; and fourthly, for payments.

The evident fact is that when I have in my pocket three rubles to spare, which I am not in need of, I have only to whistle, and in every civilized town I obtain a hundred people ready, for these three rubles, to do the worst, most disgusting, and humiliating act I require; and this comes not from money, but from the very complicated conditions of the economical life of nations.

The dominion of one man over others comes not from money, but from the circumstance that a working-man does not receive the full value of his labor; and the fact that he does not get the full value of his labor depends upon the nature of capital, rent, and wages, and upon complicated connections between them and production itself, and between the distribution and consumption of wealth.

In plain language, it means that people who have money may twist around their finger those who have none. But science says this is an illusion; that in every kind of production three factors take part, —land, savings of labor (capital), and labor; and that the dominion of the few over the many proceeds from the various connections between these factors of production, —because the two first factors, land and capital, are not in the hands of working-people: from this fact, and from the various combinations resulting therefrom, proceeds this domination.

Whence comes the great power of money which strikes us all with a sense of its injustice and cruelty? Why is one man by the means of money to have dominion over others? Science says, It comes from the division of the

agents of production, and from the consequent complicated combinations which oppress the working-man.

This answer has always appeared to me to be strange, not only because it leaves one part of the question unnoticed, namely, the signification of money, but also because of the division of the factors of production, which to an uninformed man will always appear artificial, and not in accordance with reality. It is asserted that in every production three agents come into operation,—land, capital, and labor; and along with this division it is understood that property (or its value in money) is naturally divided among those who possess one of these agents; thus, rent—the value of the ground—belongs to the landowner; interest to the capitalist; and labor to the working-man.

Is it really so?

First, is it true that in every production three agencies operate? Now, while I am writing this, around me proceeds the production of hay. Of what is this production composed? I am told of the land which produces the grass, of capital,—scythes, rakes, pitchforks, carts,—which is necessary for the housing of hay, and of labor. But I see that this is not true. Besides the land, there is the sun and rain; besides social order, which has been keeping these meadows from damage caused by letting stray cattle graze upon them, the prudence of workmen, their knowledge of language, and many other agencies of production, which, for some unknown reason, are not taken into consideration by political economy.

The power of the sun is as necessary as the land. I may instance the position of men in which (as, for instance, in a town) some of them assume the right to keep out the sun from others by means of walls or trees. Why, then, is this sun not included among the agents of production?

Rain is another means as necessary as the ground itself. The air too. I can picture to myself the position of men without water and pure air, because other men assume to themselves the right to monopolize these, which are essentially necessary to all. Public security

is likewise a necessary element; food and dress for workmen are similar means in production; this last is even recognized by some economists. Education, the knowledge of language which creates the possibility of reasonable work, is likewise an agent. I could fill a volume by enumerating such combinations, unnoticed by science.

Why, then, are three only to be chosen and laid as a foundation for the science of political economy? Why are the rays of the sun, rain, food, knowledge, not equally recognized? Why only the land, the instruments of labor, and the labor itself? Simply because the right of men to enjoy the rays of the sun, rain, food, speech, and audience are challenged only on rare occasions; but the use of land, and of the instruments of labor, are constantly challenged in society.

This is the true foundation for it; and the division of these agents for production, into three, is quite arbitrary and is not involved in the nature of things. But it may perhaps be urged that this division is so suitable to man, that, whenever economical relationships form themselves, there these appear at once and alone.

Let us see whether it is really so. First of all, I look at what is around me, — at Russian colonists, of whom millions have for long existed. They come to a land, settle themselves on it, and begin to labor; and it does not enter into the mind of any one of them that a man who does not use the land could have any claim to it, and the land does not assert any rights of its own; on the contrary, the colonists conscientiously recognize the communism of the land, and that it is right for every one of them to plow and to mow wherever he likes.

For cultivation, for gardening, for building houses, the colonists obtain various implements of labor; nor does it enter the mind of any one of them that these instruments of labor may bring profit in themselves, and the capital does not assert any rights of its own; but on the contrary, the colonists conscientiously recognize that all interest for tools, or borrowed corn or capital, is unjust.

They work upon a free land, labor with their own

tools, or with those borrowed without interest, each for himself, or all together for common business; and in such a community, it is impossible to prove either the existence of rent or interest accruing from capital, or remuneration for labor.

Speaking of such a community, I am not indulging my fancy, but am describing what has always taken place not only among primitive Russian colonists, but among so-called intellectual men, who are not few, and who have settled in Russia and in America.

I am describing what appears to every one to be natural and reasonable. Men settle on land, and each undertakes to do such business as suits him; and each, having earned what is necessary, does his own work.

And when these men find it more convenient to labor together, they form a workmen's association; but neither in separate households, nor in associations, will there appear separate agents of production, till men artificially and forcibly divide them. But there will be labor, and the necessary conditions of labor, — the sun which warms all, the air which men breathe, water which they drink, land on which they labor, clothes on the body, food in the stomach, stakes, shovels, plows, machines, with which men work; and it is evident that neither the rays of the sun, nor the clothes on the body, nor the stakes with which the man labors, nor the spade, nor the plow, nor the machine with which he works in the workmen's association, can belong to any one else but to those who enjoy the rays of the sun, breathe the air, drink the water, eat the bread, clothe their bodies, and labor with the spade or with the machine, because all this is necessary only for those who make use of it. And when men act thus, we see that they act reasonably.

Therefore, observing the economical conditions which are created among men, I do not see that the division into three is natural. I see, on the contrary, that it is neither natural nor reasonable. But perhaps the setting apart of these three does not take place in primitive societies of men, but that when the population increases,

and cultivation begins to develop, it is unavoidable ; and we cannot but recognize the fact that this division has taken place in European society. Let us see whether it is really so.

We are told that in European society this division of agencies has taken place ; that is, that one man possesses land, another possesses instruments of labor, and the third is without land and instruments. We have grown so accustomed to this assertion that we are no longer struck by the strangeness of it.

If we will but reflect upon this expression, we cannot help seeing, not only the injustice, but even the absurdity, of it. Under the idea of a laboring-man are included the land upon which he lives, and the tools with which he works. If he were not living on the land, and had no tools, he would not be a laboring-man. There has never been, and can never be, such a man without land and without tools, without scythe, cart, and horse ; there cannot be a bootmaker without a house for his work standing upon ground, without water, air, and tools with which he works.

If a laborer has no land, horse, or scythe, and a bootmaker is without a house, water, or awl, then it means that some one has driven him from the ground, or taken it away from him, or cheated him out of his scythe, cart, horse, or awl ; but it does not at all mean that there can be a country laborer without a scythe, or a bootmaker without tools.

So you cannot imagine a fisherman remaining on dry land without fishing implements, unless he has been driven away from the water by some one who has taken away from him his necessary implements for fishing ; so also we cannot picture to ourselves a workman without the ground upon which he lives, and without tools for his trade, unless somebody has driven him from the former, or robbed him of the latter.

There may be such men, hunted from one place to another, and such who, having been robbed, are compelled perforce to work for another man, and do things unnecessary for themselves ; but this does not mean

that such is the nature of production, and therefore the land and the tools cannot be considered as separate agents in the work.

But if we are to consider as the agents of production all that is claimed by other people, and what a working-man may be deprived of by the violence of others, why not count among them the claim upon the person of a slave? Why not count claims on the rain and the rays of the sun? We might meet with a man who would build a wall and thus keep the sun from his neighbor; another may come who will turn the course of a river into his own pond, and by that means contaminate its water; or an individual who would claim a fellow-man as his own property; but none of these claims, although they may be enforced by violence, can be recognized as a foundation for calculating the agents of production; and therefore it is as equally unjust to consider the exclusive enjoyment of the rays of the sun, or of the air or water, or the persons of others, as separate agents in production.

There may be men who will assert their rights to the land and to the tools of a working-man, as there were men who asserted their rights to the persons of others, and as there may be men who would assert their rights to the exclusive use of the rays of the sun, or to the use of water and air; there may be men who would drive away a working-man from place to place, taking from him by force the products of his labor as they are produced, and the very instruments for its production, who might compel him to work, not for himself, but for his master, as occurs in the factories, — all this is possible; but a working-man without land and tools is still an impossibility, just as there does not exist a man who would willingly become the property of another, notwithstanding that men have asserted their right to him for many generations.

Just as a claim on the person of another man could not deprive a slave of his innate right to seek his own welfare, and not that of his master; so, too, the claim for the exclusive possession of the land and tools of

others cannot deprive the working-man of his right, like that of every man, to live upon the land, and to work with his own tools, or those of his community, as he considers most useful for himself.

All that science can say, in examining the present economical question, is this: that in Europe there exist claims of some men to the land and the tools of working-men, in consequence of which, for some of these working-men (but by no means for all of them), the proper conditions of production are violated, so that they are deprived of land and implements of labor, and are compelled to work with the tools of others; but by no means is it established that this casual violation of the law of production is that very law itself.

In saying that this isolation of the agents of produce is the fundamental law of production, the economist is doing the very thing a zoölogist would do, who, upon seeing a great many siskins, with their wings cut, and kept in little cages, drawing water-barrels out of an imaginary well, should assert this was the most essential condition for the life of birds, and that their life is composed of these conditions.

However many siskins there may be kept in paste-board houses with their wings cut, a zoölogist cannot acknowledge these houses to be the natural home of the birds. However great the number of working-people there may be driven from place to place, and deprived of their productions as well as the tools for their labor, the natural right of man to live upon the land, and to work with his own tools, is that which he needs, and it will remain so forever.

We have some who lay claim to the land and to the tools of working-men, just as there existed in former ages the claim of some men over the persons of others; but there may be no real division of men into lords and slaves as was anciently established, nor can there exist any division in the agents of production, in land and capital, as economists want to establish at present.

These very unlawful claims of some men over the liberty of others, science calls the natural condition of pro-

duction. Instead of taking its fundamental principles from the natural properties of human societies, science took them from a particular case; and, desiring to justify this case, it recognized the right of some men to the land by which other men earned their living, and to the tools with which other men worked; in other words, it recognized as a right that which had never existed, and cannot exist, and which is in itself a contradiction, because the claim of the landowner to the land on which he does not labor is in essence nothing more than the right to use the land which he does not use; the claim on the tools of others is nothing more than a man assuming a right to work with implements with which he does not work.

Science, by isolating the agents of production, declares that the natural condition of a working-man — that is, of a man in the true sense of the word — is that unnatural condition in which he exists at present, as in ancient times, by the division of men into citizens and slaves, when it was asserted that the unnatural condition of slavery was the natural condition of life.

This very division, accepted by science only in order to justify the existing injustice, and the adjudging this division to be the foundation of all its inquiries, has for its result that science vainly tries to give some explanation of existing phenomena; and, denying the clearest and plainest answers to the questions that arise, gives answers which have no meaning in them at all.

The question of economical science is this: What is the reason of the fact that some men by means of money acquire an imaginary right to the land and capital, and may make slaves of those men who have no money? The answer which presents itself to common sense would be, that it is the result of money, the nature of which is to enslave men.

But science denies this, and says: This arises, not from the nature of money, but from the fact that some men have land and capital, and others have neither. We ask why persons who possess land and capital

oppress such as possess neither? and we are answered, Because they do possess land and capital.

But this is just what we are inquiring about. Is not deprivation of land and tools enforced slavery? Life ceases not to put this essential question: and even science herself notices it, and tries to answer it, but does not succeed in doing so; proceeding from her own fundamental principles, she only turns herself round, as in a magic circle.

In order to give itself a satisfactory answer to the above question, science has first of all to deny that wrong division of the agents of production, to cease to acknowledge the result of the phenomena as being the cause of them; and she has to seek, first the more obvious, and then the remoter, causes of those phenomena which make up the whole.

Science must answer the question: What is the reason that some men are deprived of land and tools while others possess both? or, Why is it that land and tools are taken away from persons who labor upon the land and work with the tools?

As soon as science puts this question to herself, she will at once get new ideas which will transform all the previous ideas of that sham science, which has been moving in an unalterable circle of propositions, as, for instance, the miserable condition of working-people proceeding from the fact that it is miserable. For simple-minded persons, it must seem unquestionable that the obvious reason of the oppression of some men by others is this money. But science, denying this, says that money is only a medium of exchange, which has nothing in common with oppression or slavery.

Let us see whether it is so or not.

CHAPTER XVIII

WHENCE comes money? How is it that a nation always has money, and under what circumstances is it that a nation need not use money? There is a small

tribe in Africa, and one in Australia, who live as lived the Sknepies and the Drevlyans in olden times.

These tribes lived and plowed, bred cattle, and cultivated gardens. We became acquainted with them only at the dawn of history. And history begins with recording the fact that some invaders appear on the stage. And invaders always do the same thing: they take away from the aborigines everything they can take, — cattle, corn, and stuffs; even make prisoners, male and female, and carry them away.

After some years the invaders appear again; but the people have not got over the consequences of their misfortune, and there is scarcely anything to take from them, so the invaders invent another and better means of making use of their victims.

These means are very simple, and naturally present themselves to the mind of every man. The *first* is personal slavery. There is a drawback to this, seeing the enforcers of it have to put everything into working order, and feed all the slaves; hence, naturally, there appears the *second*. The people are left on their own land, which becomes the recognized property of the invaders, who portion it out among the leading military men, in order that by means of these men they may utilize the labor of the people.

But this, too, has its drawback. It is not convenient to these officers to have an oversight over all the productions of the conquered people, and thus the *third* means is introduced, which is as primitive as the two former ones; and this is the levying of a certain obligatory tax which the conquered have to pay at stated periods.

The object of a conquest is to take from the conquered as much as possible of the products of their labor. It is evident that, in order to do this, the conquerors must take such articles as are the most valuable to the conquered, and which at the same time are not cumbersome, and are convenient for keeping — skins of animals and gold.

And the conqueror lays upon the family or the tribe

a tax in these skins or gold, which is to be paid at fixed times; and by means of this tribute, he utilizes the labor of the conquered people in the most convenient way.

Almost all the skins and all the gold are taken away from their original possessors, and therefore these are compelled to sell all they have amongst themselves to obtain gold and skins for their masters; that is, they have to sell their property and their labor.

This very thing happened in ancient times, in the Middle Ages, and occurs now too. In the ancient world, when the subjugation of one people by another was frequent, and owing to the equality of men not being acknowledged, personal slavery was the most widely spread means for compelling the service of others, and was the center of gravity in this compulsion. In the Middle Ages, feudalism—landownership and the servitude connected with it—partly takes the place of personal slavery, and the center of compulsion is transferred from persons to land; in modern times, since the discovery of America, the development of commerce, and the influx of gold, which is accepted as a universal medium of exchange, the tribute in money with the increase of the state power becomes the chief instrument for enslaving men, and upon it are now built all economical relationships.

In "The Literary Miscellany" is printed an article by Professor Yanjoul, in which he describes the recent history of the Fiji Islands. If I were trying to find the most pointed illustration of how in our time the forcible requirement of money became the chief instrument of the enslaving of some men by others, I could not imagine anything more striking and convincing than this trustworthy history,—history, based upon documents, of facts which are of recent occurrence.

In the South Sea Islands in Polynesia lives a race called Fiji. The group on which they live, says Professor Yanjoul, is composed of small isles, which all together occupy a space of about forty thousand square miles. Only half of these islands are inhabited, by one hundred and fifty thousand natives and fifteen hundred

white men. The natives had been reclaimed from a savage state a long time ago, and are distinguished among other natives of Polynesia by their intellectual capacities; and they appear to be a nation capable of labor and development, which they have also proved by the fact that in a short period of time they became good workmen and breeders of cattle.

The inhabitants were well-to-do, but in the year 1859 the condition of this new state became desperate; the natives of Fiji, and their representative, Kokab, were in need of money. The money, forty-five thousand dollars, was wanted by the government of Fiji for the payment of a contribution or indemnification, which was demanded of them by the United States of America for violence done by Fijis to some citizens of the American Republic.

For this purpose the Americans sent a squadron, which unexpectedly took possession of some of the best islands, under the pretext that they would hold them as a guarantee, and threatened to bombard and ruin the towns if the indemnification were not paid over, upon a certain date, to the representatives of America.

The Americans were among the first colonists who, together with missionaries, came to the Fiji Islands. They chose and (under one pretext or another) took possession of the best pieces of land on the islands, and established there cotton and coffee plantations. They hired whole crowds of natives, binding them by contracts unknown to this half-civilized race; or acted through special contractors or purveyors of human merchandise.

Misunderstandings between such master planters and the natives, whom they considered almost as slaves, were unavoidable; it was some of these quarrels which served as a pretext for the American indemnification.

Notwithstanding their prosperity, the Fijis had preserved almost up to the present time the forms of so-called natural economy which existed in Europe during the Middle Ages: money was scarcely in circulation among the natives, and their trade had almost exclu-

sively the character of barter, — one merchandise was exchanged for another, and a few social taxes and those of the state were taken out in productions. What were the Fiji Islanders with their King Kokab to do when the Americans required from them forty-five thousand dollars under the most terrible threat in the event of non-payment? To the Fijis the very figures appeared to be something inconceivable, to say nothing of the money itself, which they had never seen in such large quantities. After deliberating with other chiefs, Kokab made up his mind to apply to the queen of England, at first asking her to take the islands under her protection, and then plainly under her rule.

But the English regarded this request circumspectly, and were in no hurry to assist the half-savage monarch out of his difficulty. Instead of giving a direct answer, they sent, in 1860, special commissioners to make inquiries about the Fiji Islanders, in order to be able to decide whether it was worth while to annex them to the British possessions, and to lay out money to satisfy the American claims.

Meanwhile the American government continued to insist upon payment, and held as a pledge in their *de facto* dominion some of the best parts, and, having looked closely into the national wealth, raised their former claim to ninety thousand dollars, and threatened to increase it still if Kokab did not pay at once.

Being thus pushed on every side, the poor king, unacquainted with European means of credit accommodation, in accordance with the advice of European colonists, began to try to raise money in Melbourne, among the merchants, cost what it might, if even he should be obliged to yield up all his kingdom into private hands.

And so in Melbourne, in consequence of his application, a commercial society was formed. This joint-stock company, which took the name of the Polynesian Company, formed with the chiefs of the Fiji-Islanders a treaty upon terms the most advantageous to itself. It took upon itself the debt to the American government,

and pledged itself to pay it by several instalments; for this the company received, according to the first treaty, one and then two hundred thousand acres of the best land, selected by themselves; the perpetual immunity from all taxes and dues for all its factories, operations, and colonies, and the exclusive right for a long period to establish in the Fiji Islands issuing-banks, with the privilege of printing unlimited numbers of notes.

Since this treaty, definitively concluded in the year 1868, there appeared in the Fiji Islands, along with their local government with Kokab at the head, another powerful authority, — a commercial factory, with large estates over all the islands, exercising a decided influence upon the government.

Up to this time the wants of the government of Kokab had been satisfied with the payment in natural productions, which consisted of various duties and a small customs-tax on goods imported. With the conclusion of the treaty, and the forming of the influential Polyneesian Company, the king's financial circumstances had changed.

A considerable part of the best land in his dominion had passed into the hands of the company, his income from the land therefore diminished; on the other hand, the income from the customs-taxes also diminished, because the company obtained for itself an import and export of all kinds of goods free of customs-duties.

The natives — ninety-nine per cent of all the population — had always been bad payers of customs-duties, because they scarcely bought any of the European productions, except some stuffs and hardware; and now, from the freeing from customs-duties, along with the Polynesian Company, of many well-to-do Europeans, the income of King Kokab was reduced to *nil*, and he was obliged to take steps to resuscitate it if possible.

He began to consult his white friends as to how he was to avert the calamity, and they advised him to create the first direct tax in the country; and, in order, I suppose, to have less trouble about it, in money. The tax was established in the form of a general poll-tax, amount-

ing to one pound for every man, and to four shillings for every woman, throughout the islands.

As we have already said, on the Fiji Islands there still exist a natural economy and a trade by barter. Very few natives possess money. Their wealth consists chiefly of various raw productions and cattle; whilst the new tax required the possession in a family of considerable sums of money at fixed times.

Up to that date a native had not been accustomed to any individual burden in the interests of his government, except personal obligations; all the taxes which had to be paid were paid by the community or village to which he belonged, and from the common fields from which he received his principal income.

One alternative was left to him,—to try to raise money from the European colonists; that is, to address himself either to the merchant or to the planter.

To the first he was obliged to sell his productions on the merchant's own terms, because the tax-collector required money at a certain fixed date, or he had even to raise money by selling his expected production, which enabled the merchant to take iniquitous interest. Or he had to address himself to the planter, and sell him his labor; that is, to become his workman; but the wages on the Fiji Islands were very low, owing, I suppose, to the exceptionally great offer of services.

They did not exceed one shilling per week for a grown-up man, or two pounds twelve shillings a year; and therefore, in order merely to get the money necessary for the payment for himself, not to speak of his family, a Fiji had to leave his house, his family, and his own land, and often go far away to another island, and there enslave himself to the planter for at least half a year in order to get the one pound necessary for the payment of the new tax; and as for the payment of taxes for his whole family, he had to look for it to some other means.

We can understand what was the result of such a state. From a hundred and fifty thousand of his subjects, Kokab collected in all six thousand pounds; and

now there began a forcible extortion of taxes unknown till then, and a series of violent measures.

The local administration, which had been formerly incorruptible, soon made common cause with the European planters, who began to have their own way with the country. For non-payment, the Fijis were summoned to the court and were sentenced, not only to pay the expenses, but also to be sent to prison for not less than half a year. This prison was really the plantation of the first white man who chose to pay the tax-money and the legal expenses of the condemned.

Thus the white settlers received cheap labor to any amount. First this compulsory labor was fixed at not longer than half a year; but afterward the bribed judges found it possible to pass sentence for eighteen months, and then to renew the sentence.

Very quickly, in the course of a few years, the picture of the social condition of the inhabitants of Fiji was quite changed.

Whole districts, formerly flourishing, lost half of their population, and were greatly impoverished. All the male population, except the old and infirm, were working away from their homes for European planters, in order to get money necessary for the payment of taxes, or in consequence of the law court. The women on the Fiji Islands had scarcely ever worked in the fields; therefore, in the absence of the men, all farming was neglected, and went to ruin. In the course of a few years, half of the population of Fiji was transformed into slaves of the colonists.

In order to ease their situation, the Fiji Islanders again appealed to England. A new petition was got up, subscribed by a great many eminent persons and chiefs, praying to be annexed to England; and this was handed to the British consul. Meanwhile, England, thanks to her learned expedition, had time not only to investigate the affairs of the islands, but even to survey them, and duly to appreciate the natural riches of this fine corner of the globe.

Owing to all these circumstances, the negotiations

this time were crowned with full success; and in 1874, to the great dissatisfaction of the American planters, England officially took possession of the Fiji Islands, and added them to its colonies. Kokab died, and his heirs had a small pension assigned to them.

The administration of the islands was intrusted to Sir Hercules Robinson, the governor of New South Wales. In the first year of its annexation to England, the Fiji Islanders had not any self-government, but were under the direction of Sir Hercules Robinson, who had appointed an administrator for them. Taking the islands into their hands, the English government had to undertake the difficult task of gratifying various expectations raised by them.

The natives, of course, first of all expected the abolition of the hated poll-tax; one part of the white colonists (the Americans) looked with suspicion upon the British rule; and another part (those of English origin) expected all kinds of confirmations of their power over the natives, — permission to inclose the land, and so on. The English government, however, proved itself equal to the task; and its first act was to abolish forever the poll-tax, which had created the slavery of the natives in the interest of a few colonists. But here Sir Hercules Robinson had at once to face a difficult dilemma.

It was necessary to abolish the poll-tax, which had made the Fijis seek help of the English government; but, at the same time, according to English colonial policy, the colonies had to support themselves; they had to find their own means for covering the expenses of the government. With the abolition of the poll-tax, all the incomes of the Fijis (from customs-duties) did not amount to more than six thousand pounds, while the government expenses required at least seventy thousand a year.

And now Sir Hercules Robinson, having abolished the money tax, thought of a labor tax; but it did not yield the sum necessary for feeding him and his assistants. Matters did not mend until a new governor had been appointed, — Gordon, — who, in order to get out

of the inhabitants the money necessary for keeping him and his functionaries, resolved not to demand money until it had come sufficiently into general circulation on the islands, but to take from the natives their productions, and to sell them himself.

This tragical episode in the lives of the Fijis is the clearest and best proof of what is the true meaning of money in our time.

In this case everything is illustrated, the first fundamental condition of slavery, — the guns, threats, murders, and plunder, and lastly, money, the means of subjugation which has taken the place of all other. That which in an historical sketch of economical development has to be investigated during centuries, here when all the forms of monetary violence have fully developed themselves, had been concentrated into a space of ten years. The drama begins thus: the American government sends ships with loaded guns to the shores of the islands whose inhabitants they want to enslave. The pretext of this threat is monetary; but the beginning of the tragedy is the leveling of guns against all the inhabitants, — wives, children, old people, and men, — though they have not committed any crime. “Your money or your life,” — forty-five thousand dollars, then ninety thousand, or slaughter. But ninety thousand are not to be had. And now begins the second act: it is necessary to forego a slaughter, which would be bloody, terrible, and concentrated, in a short period; it is necessary to substitute a suffering less perceptible which can be laid upon all, and will last longer; and the natives with their representative seek to substitute for slaughter a slavery of money. They borrow money, and the planned means of enslaving men by money at once begins to operate like a disciplined army. In five years the thing is done, — men have not only lost their right to utilize their own land and their property, but also their liberty, — they have become slaves. Here begins act three. The situation is too painful; and the unfortunate ones are told they may change their master, and become slaves of another: there is not a thought

about freedom from the slavery brought about by the means of money. And the people call for another master, to whom they give themselves up, asking him to improve their condition. The English come and see that dominion over these islands gives them the possibility of feeding their already too greatly multiplied parasites, and the English government takes possession of these islands and their inhabitants; but it does not take them in the form of personal slaves, it does not take even the land, nor distribute it among its assistants.

These old ways are not necessary now: only one thing is necessary, — taxes, which must be large enough on the one hand to prevent the working-men from freeing themselves from virtual slavery, and on the other hand to feed luxuriously a great number of parasites. The inhabitants must pay seventy thousand pounds sterling, — that is the fundamental condition upon which England consents to free the Fijis from the American despotism, and this is just what was wanting for the final enslaving of the inhabitants. But it turned out that the Fiji Islanders cannot under any circumstances pay these seventy thousand pounds in their present state. The claim is too great.

The English temporarily modify it, and take a part of it out in natural productions in order that in time, when money has come into circulation, they may receive the full sum. They do not behave like the former company, whose conduct we may liken to the first coming of savage invaders into an uncivilized land, when they want only to take as much as possible and then decamp: but England behaves like a more clear-sighted enslaver; she does not kill at one blow the goose with the golden eggs, but feeds her in order that she may continue to lay them. England at first relaxes the reins for her own interest that she may hold them forever afterward, and so has brought the Fiji Islanders into that state of permanent monetary thralldom in which all civilized European people now are, and from which their chance of escape is not apparent.

This phenomenon repeats itself in America, in China, in Central Asia; and it is the same in the history of the conquest of all nations.

Money is an inoffensive means of exchange when it is not collected with violence, or when loaded guns are not directed from the sea-shore against the defenseless inhabitants. As soon as it is taken by force of arms, the same thing must unavoidably take place which occurred on the Fiji Islands, and has always and everywhere repeated itself.

Such men as consider it their lawful right to utilize the labor of others, and who have the means of doing so, will achieve this by means of forcibly demanding such sums of money as will compel the oppressed to become the slaves of the oppressors.

And, moreover, that will happen which occurred between the English and the Fijis, — the extortioners will always, in their demand for money, rather exceed the limit to which the amount of the sum required must rise in order that the enslaving may take place more effectually. They will respect this limit only while they have moral sense and sufficient money for themselves; they will overstep it when they lose moral sense or require funds.

As for governments, they will always exceed this limit, — first, because for a government there exists no moral sense of justice; and secondly, because, as we all know, every government is in the greatest want of money, caused by wars and the necessity of giving gratuities to their allies. All governments are insolvent, and cannot help following a maxim expressed by a Russian statesman of the eighteenth century, — that the peasant must be sheared of his wool lest it should grow too long. All governments are hopelessly in debt, and this debt on an average (not taking in consideration its occasional diminution in England and America) is growing at a terrible rate. So also grow the budgets; that is, the necessity of struggling with other extortioners, and of giving presents to those who assist in extortion.

Wages do not increase, not because of the law of rent,

but because taxes collected with violence exist, in order to take away from men their superfluities, so that they may be compelled to sell their labor to satisfy them, the utilizing of their labor being the aim of raising them.

And their labor can only be utilized when on a general average the taxes required are more than the working-people are able to give without depriving themselves of all means of subsistence. The rising of wages would put an end to the possibility of enslaving; and therefore, as long as violence exists, wages can never rise. This simple and plain mode of action by some men toward others, political economists term *the iron law*; the instrument by which such action is performed, they call a medium of exchange; and money is this inoffensive medium of exchange necessary for men in their transactions with each other.

Why is it, then, that, whenever there is no violent demand for money taxes, there has never been, and can never be, money in its true signification; but, as among the Fiji Islanders, the Phœnicians, the Kirghis, and generally among men who do not pay taxes, as among the Africans, there is either a direct exchange of produce, or arbitrary standards of value, as sheep, hides, skins, and shells?

A definite kind of money, whatever it may be, will always become, not a means of exchange, but a means of ransoming from violence; and it begins to circulate among men only when a definite standard is compulsorily required from all.

It is only then that everybody equally wants it, and only then it receives any value.

Further, it is not the thing that is most convenient for exchange that receives any value, but that which is required by the government. If gold is demanded, gold becomes valuable; if knuckle-bones were demanded, they, too, would become valuable. If it were not so, why, then, has the issue of this means of exchange always been the prerogative of the government? The Fiji Islanders, for instance, have arranged among themselves their own means of exchange; well, then, let

them be free to exchange what and how they like, and you, men possessing power, or the means of violence, do not interfere with this exchange. But instead you coin money, not allowing any one else to do so ; or, as is the case with us, you merely print some notes, engraving upon them the heads of the tsars, sign them with a particular signature, and threaten to punish every falsification of them, distribute this money to your assistants, and require everybody to give you such money or such notes with such signatures, and so many of them that a working-man must give away all his labor in order to get these very notes or coins ; and then you want to convince us that this money is necessary for us as a means of exchange.

All men are free, and none of them oppresses the others by keeping them in slavery ; but there exist only money in society and an iron law, in consequence of which rent increases, and wages diminish down to a minimum. That half (nay, more than half) of the Russian peasants, in order to pay direct and indirect taxes and land taxes, enslave themselves to labor for the landowners or for manufacturers, does not at all signify (which is obvious) ; for the violent collection of poll-taxes and indirect and land taxes which are paid in money to the government and to its assistants, — the landowners, — compels the working-man to be in slavery to those who collect money ; but it means that this money, as a means of exchange, and an iron law, exist.

Before the serfs were free, I could compel Ivan to do any work ; and if he refused to do it, I could send him to the police-sergeant, and the latter would give him the rod till he submitted. And if I compelled Ivan to overwork himself, and did not give him either land or food, the matter would go up to the authorities, and I should have to answer for it.

But now that men are free, I can compel Ivan and Peter and Sidor to do every kind of work ; and if they refuse to do it, I give them no money to pay taxes, and they will be flogged till they submit ; besides this, I may also make a German, a Frenchman, a Chinaman, and an

Indian work for me by that means, so that, if they do not submit, I shall not give them money to hire land, or to buy bread, because they have neither land nor bread. And if I make them overwork themselves, or kill them with excess of labor, nobody will say a word to me about it; and, moreover, if I have read books on political economy, I shall be strongly persuaded that all men are free, and that money does not create slavery! Our peasants have long known that with a ruble one can hurt more than with a stick. But it is only political economists who do not want to see it.

To say that money does not create bondage is to say that half a century ago servitude did not create slavery. Political economists say that money is an inoffensive medium of exchange, notwithstanding the fact that, in consequence of possessing it, one man may enslave the other. Why, then, was it not said half a century ago that servitude was, in itself, an inoffensive medium of reciprocal services, notwithstanding the fact that by no lawful means could one man enslave another?

Some men give their manual labor; and the work of others consists in taking care of the physical and intellectual welfare of the slaves, and in superintending their efforts.

And, I fancy, some have really said this.

CHAPTER XIX

IF the object of this sham, so-called science of Political Economy had not been the same as that of all other sciences of law, — the justification of violence, — it could not have avoided noticing the strange phenomenon that the distribution of wealth, and the depriving of some men of land and capital, and the enslaving of some men by others, depend upon money, and that it is only by means of money that some men utilize the labor of others, — in other words, enslave them.

I repeat it, a man who has money, may buy up and monopolize all the corn, and kill others with starvation,

completely oppressing them, as it has frequently happened before our own eyes on a very large scale.

It would seem that we ought to look out for the connection of these occurrences with money; but science, with full assurance, asserts that money has no connection whatever with the matter in question.

Science says, money is as much an article of merchandise as anything else which has the value of its production, only with this difference, — that this article of merchandise is chosen as the more convenient medium of exchange for establishing values, for saving, and for making payments. One man has made boots, another has grown wheat, the third has bred sheep; and now, in order to exchange more conveniently, they put into circulation money, which represents the equivalent of labor; and by this medium they exchange the soles of boots for a loin of mutton, or ten pounds of flour.

Students of this sham science are very fond of picturing to themselves such a state of affairs; but there has never been such a condition in the world. Such an idea about society is like the idea about the primitive, pre-historical, perfect human state, which the philosophers cherished; but there has never existed such a state.

In all human societies where there has been money, there has been also the violence of the strong and the armed over the weak and the defenseless; and wherever there has been violence, there the standard of value, — money, — be it what it may, — either cattle or hides, or skins or metals, — must have lost unavoidably its significance as a medium of exchange, and received the meaning of a ransom from violence.

Without doubt, money possesses the inoffensive properties which science enumerates; but these properties it would have only in a society in which there was no violence, in an ideal state; but in such a society, money would not be found as a general measure of value; it has never existed, and could never exist, in a society which had not come under the general violence of the state.

In all societies known to us where there is money, it

receives the signification of the medium of exchange only because it serves as a means of violence. And its chief object is to act thus, and not as a mere medium. Where there is violence, money cannot be a regular medium of exchange, because it cannot be a measure of value. And it cannot be a measure of value, because, as soon as in a society one man can take away from another the productions of his labor, this measure is directly violated. If horses and cows, bred by one man, and violently taken away by others, were brought to a market, it is plain that the value of horses and cows there would no longer correspond with the labor of breeding them; and the value of all other things would also change in accordance with this change, and money would not determine their value.

Besides, if one man may acquire by force a cow or a horse or a house, he may by the same force acquire money itself, and with this money acquire all kinds of produce. If, then, money itself is acquired by violence, and spent to purchase things, money entirely loses its quality as a medium of exchange.

The oppressor who takes away money, and gives it for the production of labor, does not exchange anything, but by the means of labor takes away all that he wants.

But let us suppose that such an imaginary and impossible state of society really existed, in which, without a general violence of the state exercised over men, money is in circulation,—silver or gold serving as a measure of value and as a medium of exchange. All the savings in such a society are expressed by money. There appears in this society an oppressor in the shape of a conqueror. Let us suppose that this oppressor takes away the cows, horses, clothes, and the houses of the inhabitants, but, as it is not convenient for him to be in possession of all this, he will therefore naturally think of taking from these men that which represents among them all kinds of value, and is exchanged for all kinds of things,—money. And at once in this community, money will receive for the oppressor and his assistants another signification; its character as a

medium of exchange will therefore cease in such a society.

The measure of the value of all things will always depend upon the pleasure of the oppressor.

The articles most necessary for him, and for which he gives more money, will receive a greater value, and *vice versa* ; so that, in a community exposed to violence, money receives at once its chief meaning, — it becomes a means of violence and a ransom from violence, and it will retain among the oppressed people its signification as a medium of exchange only so far as it is convenient for the oppressor. Let us picture the whole affair in a circle, thus:—

The serfs supply their landlord with linen, poultry, sheep, and daily labor.

The landlord substitutes money for these goods, and fixes the value of various articles sent in. Those who have no linen, corn, cattle, or manual labor to offer, may bring a definite sum of money.

It is obvious that, in the society of the peasants of this landlord, the price of various articles will always depend upon the landlord's pleasure. The landlord uses the articles collected among his peasants, and some of these articles are more necessary for him than others ; accordingly, he fixes the prices for them, more or less. It is clear that the mere will and requirements of the landlord must regulate the prices of these articles among the payers. If he is in want of corn, he will set a high price for a fixed quantity of it, and a low price for linen, cattle, or work ; and therefore those who have no corn will sell their labor, linen, and cattle to others, in order to buy corn to give to the landlord.

If the landlord chooses to substitute money for all kinds of claim, then the value of things will again depend, not upon the value of labor, but first upon the sum of money which the landlord will require, and secondly upon the articles produced by the peasants which are more necessary to the landlord, and for which he will allow a higher price.

The money claim made by the landlord upon the

peasants would cease only to have any influence upon the prices of the articles when the peasants of this landlord should live separate from other people and have no connection with any one besides themselves and the landlord; and secondly, when the landlord employs money, not in purchasing things in his own village, but elsewhere. It is only under these two conditions that the prices of things, though changed nominally, would remain relatively the same, and money would have the signification of a measure of value and of a medium of exchange.

But if the peasants have any business connections with the inhabitants surrounding them, the prices of the articles of their produce, as sold to their neighbors, would depend upon the sum of money required from them by their landlord.

(If from their neighbors less money is required than from them, then their productions would be sold cheaper than the productions of their neighbors, and *vice versa*.) And again, the money demand made by the landlord upon his peasants would cease to have any influence upon the prices of the articles, only when the sums collected by the landlord were not spent in buying the productions of his own peasants. But if he spends money in purchasing from them, it is plain that the prices of various articles will constantly vary among them according as the landlord buys more of one thing than another.

Suppose one landlord has fixed a very high poll-tax, and his neighbor a very low one; it is clear that on the estate of the first landlord everything will be cheaper than on the estate of the second, and that the prices on either estate will depend only upon the augmentation and diminution of the poll-taxes. This is one influence of violence upon value.

Another, arising out of the first, consists in the relative value of all things. Suppose one landlord is fond of horses, and pays a high price for them; another is fond of towels, and offers a high figure for them. It is obvious that on the estate of either of these two land-

lords, the horses and the towels will be dear, and the prices for these articles will not be in proportion to those of cows or of corn. If to-morrow the collector of towels dies, and his heirs are fond of poultry, then it is obvious that the price of towels will fall, and that of poultry will rise.

Wherever there is in society the mastery of one man over another, there the meaning of money as the measure of value at once yields to the will of the oppressor, and its meaning as a medium of exchange of the productions of labor is replaced by another, that of the most convenient means of utilizing the labor of others.

The oppressor wants money neither as a medium of exchange, — for he will take whatever he wants without exchange, — nor as a measure of value, — for he will himself determine the value of everything, — but only for the convenience it affords of exercising violence; and this convenience consists in the fact that money may be saved up, and is the most convenient means of holding in slavery the majority of mankind.

It is not convenient to carry away all the cattle in order always to have horses, cows, and sheep whenever wanted, because they must be fed; the same holds good with corn, for it may be spoiled; the same with slaves, — sometimes a man may require thousands of workmen, and sometimes none. Money demanded from those who have not got it makes it possible to get rid of all these inconveniences, and to have everything that is required; this is why the oppressor wants money. Besides this, he wants money in order that his right to utilize another's labor may not be confined to certain men, but may be extended to all men who likewise require it.

When there was no money in circulation, each landlord could utilize the labor only of his own serfs; but when they agreed to demand from their peasants money which they had not, they were all enabled to appropriate without distinction the labor of the men on every estate.

Thus the oppressor finds it more convenient to press all his claims upon another's labor in the shape of money, and for this sole object is it desired. To the victim from whom it is taken away, money cannot be of use, either for the purpose of exchange, seeing he exchanges without money, as all nations have exchanged who had no government; nor for a measure of value, because this is fixed without him; nor for the purpose of saving, because the man whose productions are taken away cannot save; neither for payments, because an oppressed man will always have more to pay than to receive; and if he does receive anything, the payment will be made, not in money, but in articles of merchandise in either case; whether the workman takes goods out of his master's shop as remuneration for his labor, or whether he buys the necessaries of life with all his earnings in other shops, the money is required from him, and he is told by his oppressors that if he does not pay it, they will refuse to give him land or bread, or will take away his cow or his horse, or condemn him to work, or put him in prison. He can only free himself from all this by selling the productions of his toil, his own labor, or that of his children.

And this he will have to sell according to those prices which will be established, not by a regular exchange, but by the authority which demands money of him.

Under the conditions of the influence of tribute and taxes upon the prices which everywhere and always repeat themselves, as with the landowners in a narrow circle, so also with the state on a larger scale (in which the causes of the modification of prices are as obvious to us as it is obvious how the hands and feet of puppets are set in motion, to those who look behind the curtain and see who are the wire-pullers), — under these circumstances, to say that money is a medium of exchange and a measure of value is at least astonishing.

CHAPTER XX

ALL slavery is based solely on the fact that one man can deprive another of his life, and by threatening to do so compel him to do his will. We may see for certain that whenever one man is enslaved by another, when against his own will, and according to the will of another, he does certain actions, which are contrary to his inclination, the cause, if traced to its source, is nothing more nor less than a result of this threat. If a man gives to others all his labor, has not enough to eat, has to send his little children from home to work hard, leaves his family and devotes all his life to a hated and unnecessary task, as happens before our own eyes in the world (which we term civilized because we ourselves live in it), then we may certainly say that he does so only because not to do so would be equivalent to loss of life.

And therefore in our civilized world, where the majority of people, amidst terrible privations, perform hated labors unnecessary to themselves, the greater number of men are in slavery based upon the threat of being deprived of their existence. Of what, then, does this slavery consist? And wherein lies this power of threat?

In olden times the means of subjugation and the threat to kill were plain and obvious to all; the primitive means of enslaving men consisted then in a direct threat to kill with the sword.

An armed man said to an unarmed, "I can kill thee, as thou hast seen I have done to thy brother, but I do not want to do it: I will spare thee, — first, because it is not agreeable for me to kill thee; secondly, because, as well for me as for thee, it will be more convenient that thou shouldst labor for me than that I should kill thee. Therefore do all I order thee to do, but know that, if thou refusest, I will take thy life."

So the unarmed man submitted to the armed one, and did everything which he was ordered to do. The unarmed man labored, the armed threatened. This was

that personal slavery which appeared first among all nations, and which still exists among primitive races.

This means of enslaving always begins the work ; but when life becomes more complicated, it undergoes a change. With the complication of life, such a means presents great inconveniences to the oppressor. He, in order to appropriate the labor of the weak, has to feed and clothe them, and keep them able to work, and so the number of slaves is diminished ; besides, this compels the enslaver to remain continually with the enslaved, driving him to work by the threat of murdering him. And thus is developed another means of subjugation.

Five thousand years ago (as we find in the Bible) this novel, convenient, and clever means of oppression was discovered by Joseph the Beautiful.

It is similar to that employed now in the menageries for taming restive horses and wild beasts.

It is hunger !

This contrivance is thus described in the Bible :—

Genesis xli. 48 : And he gathered up all the food of the seven years, which were in the land of Egypt, and laid up the food in the cities ; the food of the field, which was round about every city, laid he up in the same.

49. And Joseph gathered corn as the sand of the sea, very much, until he left numbering ; for it was without number.

53. And the seven years of plenteousness, that was in the land of Egypt, were ended.

54. And the seven years of dearth began to come, according as Joseph had said : and the dearth was in all lands ; but in all the land of Egypt, there was bread.

55. And when all the land of Egypt was famished, the people cried to Pharaoh for bread : and Pharaoh said unto all the Egyptians, Go unto Joseph ; what he saith to you, do.

56. And the famine was over all the face of the

earth: and Joseph opened all the storehouses, and sold unto the Egyptians; and the famine waxed sore in the land of Egypt.

57. And all countries came into Egypt to Joseph for to buy corn; because that the famine was so sore in all lands.

Joseph, making use of the primitive means of enslaving men by the threat of the sword, gathered corn during the seven years of plenty in expectation of seven years of famine, which generally follow years of plenty, — men know all this without the dreams of Pharaoh, — and then by the pangs of hunger he more securely and conveniently made all the Egyptians and the inhabitants of the surrounding countries slaves to Pharaoh. And when the people began to be famished, he arranged matters so as to keep them in his power forever.

Genesis xlvii. 13: And there was no bread in all the land; for the famine was very sore, so that the land of Egypt and all the land of Canaan fainted by reason of the famine.

14. And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought; and Joseph brought the money into Pharaoh's house.

15. And when money failed in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, all the Egyptians came unto Joseph, and said, Give us bread: for why should we die in thy presence? for the money faileth.

16. And Joseph said, Give your cattle; and I will give you for your cattle, if money fail.

17. And they brought their cattle unto Joseph: and Joseph gave them bread in exchange for horses, and for the flocks, and for the cattle of the herds, and for the asses: and he fed them with bread for all their cattle for that year.

18. When that year was ended, they came unto him the second year, and said unto him, We will not hide it from my lord, how that our money is spent; my lord

also hath our herds of cattle ; there is not aught left in the sight of my lord, but our bodies, and our lands :

19. Wherefore shall we die before thine eyes, both we and our land ? buy us and our land for bread, and we and our land will be servants unto Pharaoh : and give us seed, that we may live, and not die, that the land be not desolate.

20. And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh ; for the Egyptians sold every man his field, because the famine prevailed over them ; so the land became Pharaoh's.

21. And as for the people, he removed them to cities from one end of the borders of Egypt even to the other end thereof.

22. Only the land of the priests bought he not ; for the priests had a portion assigned them of Pharaoh, and did eat their portion which Pharaoh gave them : wherefore they sold not their lands.

23. Then Joseph said unto the people, Behold, I have bought you this day and your land for Pharaoh : lo, here is seed for you, and ye shall sow the land.

24. And it shall come to pass in the increase, that ye shall give the fifth part unto Pharaoh, and four parts shall be your own, for seed of the field, and for your food, and for them of your households, and for food for your little ones.

25. And they said, Thou hast saved our lives ; let us find grace in the sight of my lord, and we will be Pharaoh's servants.

26. And Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day, that Pharaoh should have the fifth part ; except the land of the priests only, which became not Pharaoh's.

Formerly, in order to appropriate labor, Pharaoh had to use violence toward them ; but now, when the stores and the land belonged to Pharaoh, he had only to keep these stores by force, and by means of hunger compel men to labor for him.

All the land now belonged to Pharaoh, and he had

all the stores (which were taken away from the people); and therefore, instead of driving them to work individually by the sword, he had only to keep food from them, and they were enslaved, not by the sword, but by hunger.

In a year of scarcity, all men may be starved to death at Pharaoh's will; and in a year of plenty, all may be killed who, from casual misfortunes, have no stores of corn.

And thence comes into operation the second means of enslaving, not directly with the sword,—that is, by the strong man driving the weak one to labor under threat of killing him,—but by the strong one having taken away from the weak the stores of corn which, keeping by the sword, he compels the weak to work for.

Joseph said to the hungry men, "I could starve you to death, because I have the corn; but I will spare your life, but only under the condition that you do all I order you for the food which I will give you." For the first means of enslaving, the oppressor needs only soldiers to ride to and fro among the inhabitants, and under threat of death make them fulfil the requirements of their master. And thus the oppressor has only to pay his soldiers; but with the second means, besides these the oppressor must have different assistants for keeping and protecting the land and stores from the starving people.

These are the Josephs and his stewards and distributors. And the oppressor has to reward them, and to give Joseph a dress of fine linen, a gold ring, and servants, and corn and silver to his brothers and relatives. Besides this, from the very nature of this second means, not only the stewards and their relations, but all those who have stores of corn, become participators in this violence, just as by the first means, based upon crude force, every one who has arms becomes a partner in tyranny; so by this means, based upon hunger, every one who has stores of provision shares in it, and has power over those who have no stores.

The advantage of this means over the former for the oppressor consists, first and chiefly, in the fact that he need no longer compel the working-men by force to do his will, for they themselves come to him, and sell themselves to him; secondly, in the circumstance that fewer men escape from his violence: the drawback is that he has to employ a greater number of men. For the oppressed the advantage of it consists in the fact that they are no longer exposed to rough violence, but are left to themselves, and can always hope to pass from being the oppressed to become oppressors in their turn, which they sometimes really do by fortunate circumstances. The drawback for them is that they can never escape from participating in the oppression of others.

This new means of enslaving generally comes into operation together with the old one; and the oppressor lessens the one and increases the other according to his desires.

But this does not fully satisfy the man who wishes to have as little trouble and care as possible, and to take away as much as possible of the productions of labor of as many working-people as he can find, and to enslave as many men as possible; and therefore a third means of oppression is evolved.

This is the slavery of taxation, and, like the second, it is based upon hunger; but to the means of subduing men by depriving them of bread, is added the privation of other necessities of life.

The oppressor requires from the slaves such a quantity of money which he himself has coined, that, in order to obtain it, the slaves are compelled to sell not only stores of corn in greater quantity than the fifth part which was fixed by Joseph, but the first necessities of life as well, — meat, skins, wool, clothes, firewood, even their dwellings; and therefore the oppressor always keeps his slaves in his power, not only by hunger, but by hunger, thirst, cold, and other privations.

And then the third means of slavery comes into operation, a monetary, a tributary one, consisting in the

oppressor saying to the oppressed, "I can do with each of you just what I like, I can kill and destroy you by taking away the land by which you earn your living; I can, with this money which you must give me, buy all the corn upon which you feed, and sell it to strangers, and at any time annihilate you by starvation; I can take from you all that you have, — your cattle, your houses, your clothes; but it is neither convenient nor agreeable for me to do so, and therefore I let you alone, to work as you please; only give me so much of the money which I demand of you, either as a poll-tax, or according to the quantity of your food and drink, or your clothes or your houses. Give me this money, and do what you like among yourselves, but know that I shall neither protect nor maintain widows nor orphans nor invalids nor old people, nor such as have been burned out; I shall only protect the regular circulation of this money. This right will always be mine, to protect only those who regularly give me the fixed number of these pieces of money; as to how or where you get it, I will not in the least trouble myself." And so the oppressor distributes these pieces of money as an acknowledgment that his demand has been complied with.

The second means of enslaving consists in that, having taken away the fifth part of the harvest, and collected stores of corn, the Pharaoh, besides the personal slavery by the sword, receives, by his assistants, the possibility of dominion over the working-people during the time of famine, and over some of them forever from misfortunes which happen to them.

The third means consists in this: Pharaoh requires from the working-people more money than the value of the fifth part of corn which he took from them; he, together with his assistants, gets a new means of dominion over the working-class, not merely during the famine and their casual misfortunes, but permanently. By the second means, men retain stores of corn which help them to bear indifferent harvests and casual misfortunes without going into slavery; by the third, when there are more demands, the stores, not of corn only, but of all

other necessities of life, are taken away from them, and at the first misfortune a working-man, having neither stores of corn, nor any other stores which he might have exchanged for corn, falls into slavery to those who have money.

For the first, an oppressor need have only soldiers, and share the booty with them; for the second, he must have, besides the protectors of the land and the stores of corn, collectors and clerks for the distribution of this corn; for the third, he must have, besides the soldiers for keeping the land and his property, collectors of taxes, assessors of direct and indirect taxation, supervisors, custom-house clerks, managers of money, and coiners of it.

The organization of the third means is much more complicated than that of the second. By the second, the getting in of corn may be leased out, as was the case in olden times and is still in Turkey; but by putting taxes on men, there is need of a complicated administration, which has to insure that the taxes are rightly levied. And therefore, by the third means, the oppressor has to share the plunder with a still greater number of men than by the second; besides, according to the very nature of the thing, all those men of the same or of the foreign country who possess money become sharers with the oppressed.

The advantage of this means over the first and second consists in the following fact: chiefly that by it there is no need of waiting for a year of scarcity, as in the time of Joseph, but years of famine are established forever, and (whilst by the second method the part of the labor which is taken away depends upon the harvest, and cannot be augmented *ad libitum*, because if there is no corn, there can be nothing to take) by the new monetary method the requirement can be brought to any desired limit, for the demand for money can always be satisfied, because the debtor, in order to satisfy it, will sell his cattle, clothes, or houses. The chief advantage of this means to the oppressor consists in the fact that by it he can take away the greatest quantity of labor and in the

most convenient way; for a money-tax, like a screw, may easily and conveniently be screwed up to the utmost limit, and golden eggs be obtained though the bird that lays them is all but dead.

Another of its advantages for the oppressor is that its violence reaches all those also who, by possessing no land, escaped from it formerly by giving only a part of their labor for corn; and now, besides that part which they give for corn, they must give another part for taxes. A drawback for the oppressor is that he has to share the plunder with a still greater number of men, not only with his direct assistants, but also with all those men of his own country, and even foreign countries, who may have the money which is demanded from the slaves.

Its advantage for the oppressed is only that he is allowed greater independence: he may live wherever he chooses, do whatever he likes; he may sow or not sow; he has not to give any account of his labor; and if he has money, he may consider himself entirely free, and constantly hope, though only for a time, when he has money to spare, to obtain not only an independent position, but even to become an oppressor himself.

The drawback is that, on a general average, the situation of the oppressed becomes much worse, and they are deprived of the greater part of the productions of their labor, because by it the number of those who utilize the labor of others increases, and therefore the burden of keeping them falls upon a smaller number of men. This third means of enslaving men is also a very old one, and comes into operation with the former two without entirely excluding them.

All three have always been in operation. All may be likened to screws, which secure the board which is laid upon the working-people, and which presses them down. The fundamental or middle screw, without which the other screws could not hold, which is first screwed up, and which is never slackened, is the screw of personal slavery, the enslaving of some men by others under threat of slaughter; the second, which is screwed up after the first, is that of enslaving men by

taking away the land and stores of provisions from them, such abduction being maintained under threat to murder; and the third screw is slavery enforced by the requirement of certain coins; and this demand is also maintained under threat of murder.

These three screws are made fast, and it is only when one of them is tightened that the two others are slackened. For the complete enslaving of the working-man, all three are necessary; and in our society, all three are in operation together. The first means by personal slavery under the threat of murder by the sword has never been abolished, and never will be so long as there is oppression, because all kinds of oppression are based upon this alone. We are all very sure that personal slavery is abolished in our civilized world; that the last remnant of it has been annihilated in America and in Russia, and that it is only among barbarians that real slavery exists, and that with us it is no longer in being.

We forget only one small circumstance,—those hundreds of millions of standing troops, without which no state exists, and with the abolition of which all the economical organization of each state would inevitably fall to pieces. Yet what are these millions of soldiers but the personal slaves of those who rule over them? Are not these men compelled to do the will of their commanders, under the threat of torture and death,—a threat often carried out? the difference consisting only in the fact that the submission of these slaves is not called slavery, but discipline; the only difference being that slaves are so from their birth, and soldiers only during a more or less short period of their so-called service.

Personal slavery, therefore, is not only not abolished in our civilized world, but, under the general system of recruiting, it has become confirmed of late years; and as it has always existed, so it has remained, having only somewhat changed from its original form. And it cannot but exist, because, so long as there is the enslaving of one man by another, there will be this personal

slavery too, that which under threat of the sword maintains the serfdom of landownership and taxes.

It may be that this slavery, that is, of troops, is necessary, as it is said, for the defense and the glory of the country; but this kind of utility is more than doubtful, because we see how often in the case of unsuccessful wars it serves only for the subjugation and shame of the country; but the expediency of this slavery for maintaining that of the land and taxes is unquestionable.

If Irish or Russian peasants were to take possession of the land of the landowners, troops would be sent to dispossess them.

If you build a distillery or a brewery, and do not pay excise, then soldiers will be sent to shut it up. Refuse to pay taxes, the same thing will happen to you.

The second screw is the means of enslaving men by taking away from them the land and their stores of provisions. This means has also been always in existence wherever men are oppressed; and, whatever changes it may undergo, it is everywhere in operation.

Sometimes all the land belongs to the sovereign, as is the case in Turkey, and there one-tenth is given to the state treasury. Sometimes a part of the land belongs to the sovereign, and taxes are raised upon it. Sometimes all the land belongs to a few people, and is let out for labor, as is the case in England. Sometimes more or less large portions of the land belong to the landowners, as is the case in Russia, Germany, and France. But wherever there is enslaving, there exists also the appropriation of the land by the oppressor. This screw is slackened or tightened according to the condition of the other screws.

Thus, in Russia, when personal slavery was extended to the majority of working-people, there was no need of land slavery; but the screw of personal slavery was slackened in Russia only when the screws of land and tax slavery were tightened.

In England, for instance, the land slavery is preëminently in operation, and the question about the nation

alizing of the lands consists only in the screw of taxation being tightened in order that the screw of land appropriation may be slackened.

The third means of enslaving men, by taxes, has also been in operation for ages ; and in our days, with the extension of uniform standards of money and the strengthening of the state power, it has received only a particular influence.

This means is so worked out in our days, that it tends to substitute the second means of enslaving, — the land monopoly.

This is the screw by the tightening of which the screw of land slavery is slackened, as is obvious from the politico-economical state of all Europe.

We have, in our lifetime, witnessed in Russia two transformations of slavery : when the serfs were liberated, and their landlords retained the right to the greater part of the land, the landlords were afraid that they were going to lose their power over their slaves ; but experience has shown that, having let go the old chain of personal slavery, they had only to seize another, — that of the land. A peasant was short of corn, he had not enough to live on ; and the landlord had land and stores of corn, and therefore the peasant still remained the same slave.

Another transformation was caused by the government screw of taxation being pressed home, when the majority of working-people, having no stores, were obliged to sell themselves to their landlords and to the factories. The new form of oppression held the people still tighter, so that nine-tenths of the Russian working-people are working for their landlords and in the factories to pay these taxes. This is so obvious that, if the government were not to raise taxes for one year only, all labor would be stopped in the fields of the landlords and in the factories. Nine-tenths of the Russian people hire themselves out during and before the collection of taxes. All these three means have never ceased to operate, and are still in operation ; but men are inclined to ignore them, and new excuses are invented for them.

And what is most remarkable of all is this, that the very means on which, at the moment in question, everything is based, that screw which is screwed up tighter than all others, which holds everything, is not noticed so long as it holds. When in the ancient world all the economical administration was upheld by personal slavery, the greatest intellects did not notice it. To Plato, as well as to Xenophon and Aristotle and to the Romans, it seemed that it could not be otherwise, and that slavery was an unavoidable and natural result of wars, without which the existence of mankind could not be thought of. So also in the Middle Ages and up to the present time, men have not apprehended the meaning of landownership, upon which depended all the economical administration of their time.

So also, at present, no one sees, or wants to see, that in our time the enslaving of the majority of the people depends upon taxes collected by the government from its own land slaves, taxes collected *by the troops*, by the very same troops, which are maintained by means of these taxes.

CHAPTER XXI

No wonder that the slaves themselves, who have always been enslaved, do not understand their own position, and that this condition in which they have always been living is considered by them to be that natural to human life, and that they hail as a relief any change in their form of slavery; no wonder that their owners sometimes quite sincerely think they are, in a measure, freeing the slaves by slackening one screw, though they are compelled to do so by the over-tension of another.

Both become accustomed to their state; and one part, — the slaves, — never having known what freedom is, merely seek an alleviation, or only the change of their condition; the other, — the owners, — wishing to mask their injustice, try to assign a particular meaning to

those new forms of slavery which they enforce in place of older ones: but it is wonderful how the majority of the investigators of the economical conditions of the life of the people fail to see that which forms the basis of all the economical conditions of a people.

It would seem that the duty of a true science was to try to ascertain the connection of the phenomena and general cause of a series of occurrences. But the majority of the representatives of modern Political Economy are doing just the reverse of this: they carefully hide the connection and meaning of the phenomena, and avoid answering the most simple and essential questions.

Modern Political Economy, like an idle, lazy cart-horse, goes well only downhill, when it has no collar-work; but as soon as it has anything to draw, it at once refuses, pretending it has to go somewhere aside after its own business. When any grave, essential question is put to Political Economy, scientific discussions are started about some matter or other, which does not in the least concern the question.

You ask, How are we to account for a fact so unnatural, monstrous, unreasonable, and not useless only, but harmful, that some men can eat or work only in accordance with the will of other men?

And you are gravely answered, Because some men must arrange the labor and the feeding of others, — such is the law of production.

You ask, What is this right of property, according to which some men appropriate to themselves the land, food, and instruments of labor belonging to others? You are again gravely answered, This right is based upon the protection of labor, — that is, the protection of some men's labor is effected by taking possession of the labor of other men.

You ask, What is that money which is everywhere coined and stamped by the governments, by the authorities, and which is so exorbitantly demanded from the working-people, and which in the shape of national debts is levied upon the future generations of working-men? And further, has not this money, demanded from

the people in the shape of taxes, raised to the utmost pitch, has not this money any influence upon the economical relationships of men, — between the payers and the receivers? And you are answered in all seriousness, Money is an article of merchandise like sugar, or chintz; and it differs from other articles only in the fact that it is more convenient for exchange.

As for the influence of taxes upon the economical conditions of a people, it is a different question altogether: the laws of production, exchange, and distribution of wealth are one thing, but taxation is quite another. You ask whether it has any influence upon the economical conditions of a people that the government can arbitrarily raise or lower prices, and, having augmented the taxes, can enslave all those who have no land? The pompous answer is, The laws of production, exchange, and distribution of wealth are one science, — Political Economy; and taxes, and, generally speaking, State Economy, come under another head, — the Law of Finance.

You ask finally, Is there no influence exercised upon economical conditions by the circumstance that all the people are in bondage to the government, and that this government can arbitrarily ruin all men, take away all the productions of men's labor, and even carry the men themselves away from their labor into military slavery? You are answered, That this is altogether a different question, belonging to the State Law.

The majority of the representatives of science discuss quite seriously the laws of the economical life of a people, while all the functions and activities of this life are dependent upon the will of the oppressor; while at the same time, recognizing the influence of the oppressor as a natural condition of the life of a people, they do the same thing that an investigator of the economical conditions of the life of the personal slaves of different masters would do, were he not to consider the influence exercised upon the life of these slaves by the will of that master who compels them to labor upon this or that thing, and who drives them from one place to another,

according to his pleasure, who feeds them or neglects to do so, who kills them or leaves them alive.

A dreadful superstition has been long, and is still, in existence, — a superstition which has done more harm to men than all the most terrible religious superstitions.

And so-called science supports this superstition with all its power, and with the utmost zeal. This superstition resembles exactly the religious one, and consists in affirming that, besides the duties of man to man, there are still more important duties toward an imaginary being, which theologians call God, and political science the State.

The religious superstition consists in this: That the sacrifices, sometimes of human lives, offered to this imaginary being, are necessary, and that they can and ought to be enforced by every means, even by violence. The political superstition consists in this: That, besides the duties of man to man, there exist still more important duties to an imaginary being; and the offerings, very often of human lives, brought to this imaginary being, — the State, — are also necessary, and can and ought to be enforced by every means, even by violence.

This very superstition, which was formerly encouraged by the priests of different religions, is now sustained by so-called science.

Men are thrown into slavery, into the most terrible slavery, worse than has ever before existed; but so-called science tries to persuade men that such is necessary, and cannot be avoided.

The state must exist for the welfare and business of the people, to rule and protect them from their enemies.

For this purpose the state wants money and troops. Money must be subscribed by all the citizens of the state. And hence all the relationships of men must be considered under the conditions of the existence of the state.

"I want to help my father by my labor," says a common, unlearned man. "I want also to marry; but, instead, I am taken and sent to Kazan, to be a soldier for six years. I leave the military service. I want to plow the ground, and earn food for my family; but I

am not allowed to plow for one hundred versts around me, unless I pay money, which I have not got, and pay it to those men who do not understand how to plow, and who require for the land so much money, that I must give them all my labor to procure it: however, I still manage to save something and I want to give my savings to my children; but a police sergeant comes to me, and takes from me all I had saved for taxes; I earn a little more, and am again deprived of it. All my economical activity is under the influence of state demands; and it appears to me that the amelioration of my position, and that of my brethren, will follow our liberation from the demands of the state."

But he is told such reasoning is the result of his ignorance.

Study the laws of production, exchange, and distribution of wealth, and do not mix up economical questions with those of the state.

The phenomena which you point to are not at all a constraint put upon your freedom; but they are those necessary sacrifices which you, along with others, must make for your own freedom and welfare.

"But my son has been taken away from me," says again a common man, "and they threaten to take away all my sons as soon as they are grown up; they took him away by force, and drove him to face the enemy's guns into some country which we have never heard of, and for an object which we cannot understand,

"And as for the land which they do not allow us to plow, and for want of which we are starving, it belongs to a man who got possession of it by force and whom we have never seen, and whose affairs we cannot even understand. And the taxes, to collect which the police sergeant has by force taken away my cow from my children, so far as I know, will go over to this same man who took my cow away, and to various members of committees, and of departments which I do not know of and in the utility of which I do not believe. How is it, then, that all these acts of violence secure my liberty, and all this evil is to procure good?"

You may compel a man to be a slave, and to do that which he considers to be evil for himself, but you cannot compel him to think that in suffering violence he is free, and that the obvious evil which he endures constitutes his good.

Yet this seemingly impossible thing has been done in our days.

The government, that is, the armed oppressors, decide what they want from those whom they oppress (as in the case of England and the Fiji Islanders): they decide how much labor they want from their slaves, — they decide how many assistants they will need in collecting the fruits of this labor; they organize their assistants in the shape of soldiers, landowners, and collectors of taxes.

And the slaves give their labor, and, at the same time, believe that they give it, not because their masters demand it, but for the sake of their own freedom and welfare; and that this service and these bloody sacrifices to the divinity called State are necessary, and that, barring this service to their Deity, they are free. They believe it because the same had been formerly said in the name of religion by the priests, and is now said in the name of so-called science — by learned men.

But one need only cease to believe what is said by other men, who call themselves priests or learned men, in order that the absurdity of such an assertion may become obvious.

The men who oppress others assure them that this oppression is necessary for the state, — and the state is necessary for the freedom and welfare of men; so that it appears that the oppressors oppress men for the sake of their freedom, and do them evil for the sake of good. But men are furnished with reason in order to understand wherein consists their own good, and to do it willingly.

As for the acts, the goodness of which is not intelligible to men, and to which they are compelled by force, such cannot serve for their good, because a reasoning being may consider as good only the thing which appears so to his reason. If men from passion or

folly are driven to evil, all that those who are not so driven can do is to persuade men as to what constitutes their real good. You may try to persuade men that their welfare will be greater when they are all become soldiers, are deprived of land, and have given their whole labor away for taxes; but until all men consider this condition to be their welfare, and undertake it willingly, one cannot call such a state of things the common welfare of men.

The willing acceptance of a condition by men is the sole criterion of its good. And the lives of men abound with such acts. Ten workmen buy tools in common, in order to work together with them, and in so doing they are undoubtedly benefiting themselves; but we cannot suppose that if these ten workmen were to compel an eleventh, by force, to join in their association, they would insist that their common welfare will be the same for him.

And so with gentlemen who agree to give a subscription dinner at a pound a head to a mutual friend, — no one can assert that such a dinner will benefit a man who, against his will, has been obliged to pay a sovereign for it; and so with peasants who decide, for their common convenience, to dig a pond.

For those who consider the existence of such more valuable than the labor spent upon it, the digging of it will be a common good. But to the one who considers the existence of the pond of less value than a day's harvesting, in which he is behindhand, the digging of it will appear evil. The same holds good with roads, churches, and museums, and with all various social and state affairs.

All such work may be good for those who consider it good, and who therefore freely and willingly perform it, — the dinner which the gentlemen give, the pond which the peasants dig. But the work to which men must be driven by force ceases to be a common good precisely by the fact of such violence. All this is so plain and simple, that if men had not been so long deceived, there would be no need to explain it.

Suppose we live in a village where all the inhabitants have agreed to build a viaduct over the morass which is a danger to them. We agree together, and promise to give from each house so much in money or wood or days of labor. We agree to do this because the making of this road is more advantageous to us than what we exchange for it; but among us there are some for whom it is more advantageous to do without a road than to spend money on it, or who, at all events, think it is so. Can the compelling of these men to make the way make it of advantage to them? Obviously not; because those who considered that their joining by choice in making the way would have been to their disadvantage, will consider it, *a fortiori*, still more disadvantageous when they are compelled to do so. Suppose, even, that we all without exception were agreed, and promised so much money or labor from each house, but that it happened that some of those who had promised did not give what they agreed on, their circumstances having meanwhile changed, so that it is more advantageous for such now to be without the road than to spend money on it; or that they have simply changed their mind about it, or even calculate that others will make the road without them, and that they will pass over it. Can the compelling of these men to join in the labor make them consider the sacrifices enforced upon them their own good?

Obviously not; because if such have not fulfilled what they have promised, owing to a change in their circumstances, so that now the sacrifices for the sake of the road outbalance their gain by it, the compulsory sacrifices of such would be only a worse evil. But if those who refuse to join in building the bridge have in view the utilizing of the labor of others, then in this case also the compelling them to make a sacrifice would be only a punishment on a supposition, and their object, which nobody can prove, will be punished before it is made apparent; but in neither case can the compelling them to join in a work undesired by them be good for them.

And if it be so with sacrifices for a work comprehen-

sible by all, obvious and undoubtedly useful to all, as a road over a morass, how still more unjust and unreasonable is the compelling of millions of men to make sacrifices, the object of which is incomprehensible, imperceptible, and often undoubtedly harmful, as is the case with military service and with taxes.

But it is believed that what appears to every one to be an evil is a common good: it appears that there are men, a small minority, who alone know what the common good consists in, and, notwithstanding the fact that all other men consider this common good to be an evil, this minority can compel other men to do whatever they may consider to be for the common good. This constitutes the chief superstition and the chief deceit, which hinders the progress of mankind toward the True and the Good.

The nursing of this superstitious deceit has been the object of political sciences in general, and of so-called Political Economy in particular.

Many are making use of it in order to hide from men the state of oppression and slavery in which they now are.

The way they set about doing so is by starting the theory that violence, connected with the economy of social slavery, is a natural and unavoidable evil, and men thereby are deceived, and turn their eyes from the real causes of their misfortunes.

Slavery has long been abolished. It has been abolished as well in Rome as in America, and among ourselves; but the word only has been abolished, and not the evil.

Slavery is the violent freeing of some men from the labor necessary for satisfying their wants, which transfers this labor to others; and wherever there is a man who does not work, not because others willingly and lovingly work for him, but because he has the possibility, while not working himself, to make others work for him, there is slavery.

And wherever there are, as is the case with all European societies, men who by means of violence utilize

the labor of thousands of others, and consider such to be their right, and others who submit to this violence considering it to be their duty, — there is slavery in its most dreadful proportions.

Slavery does exist. In what, then, does it consist? In that by which it has always consisted, and without which it cannot exist at all, — in the violence of a strong and armed man over a weak and unarmed one.

Slavery with its three fundamental modes of operation, — personal violence, soldiery, land-taxes, — maintained by soldiery, and direct and indirect taxes put upon all the inhabitants, and so maintained, is still in operation now as it has been before.

We do not see it, because each of these three forms of slavery has received a new justification, which hides its meaning from us.

The personal violence of armed over unarmed men received its justification in the defense of the country from its imaginary enemies, while in its essence it has the one old meaning, — the submission of the conquered to the oppressors.

The taking away by violence from the laborers of their land was justified as a recompense for services rendered to an imaginary common welfare, and is confirmed by the right of heritage; but in reality it is the same depriving men of land and enslaving them, which has been performed by the troops.

And the last, the monetary violence by means of taxes, the strongest and most effective in our days, had received a most wonderful justification.

The depriving men of the possession of their liberty and of all their goods is said to be done for the sake of the common liberty and of the common welfare. But in fact it is the same slavery, only an impersonal one.

Wherever violence is turned into law, there is slavery.

Whether violence finds its expression in the circumstance that princes with their courtiers come, kill, and burn down villages, or in the fact that the slaveowners take labor or money for the land from their slaves, and enforce payment by means of armed men, or by putting

taxes on others, and riding armed to and fro in the villages, or in the circumstance of a home department collecting money through governors and police sergeants, — in one word, as long as violence is maintained by the bayonet, there will be no distribution of wealth, but it will all be accumulated among the oppressors. As a striking illustration of the truth of this assertion, the project of Mr. George as to the nationalization of the land may serve us.

Mr. George proposes to recognize all the land as the property of the state, and therefore to substitute the land-rent for all the taxes, direct and indirect. That is, that every one who utilizes the land would have to pay to the state the value of its rent.

What would be the result? The land slavery would be quite abolished within the limits of the state, and the land would belong to the state, — English land to England, American to America, and so on; so that there would be a slavery which would be determined by the quantity of utilized land. It might be that the condition of some laborers would improve, but while a forcible demand for rent remained, the slavery would remain too.

The laborer, after a bad harvest, being unable to pay the rent required from him, in order not to lose everything and to retain the land, would be obliged to enslave himself to any one who happened to have the money. If a pail leaks, there must be a hole. On looking to the bottom of the pail, we may imagine that water runs from different holes; but however many imaginary holes we tried to stop from without, the water would not cease running.

In order to put a stop to this leakage, we must find the place out of which water runs, and stop it from the inside. The same holds good with the proposed means of stopping the irregular distribution of wealth, — the holes through which the wealth runs away from the people.

It is said, Organize working-men's corporations, make capital social property, make land social property. All

this is only the mere stopping from the outside of those holes from which we fancy water runs away. In order to stop wealth going from the hands of working-men to those of non-working-men, it is necessary to try to find out from inside the hole through which this leakage takes place. This hole is the violence of armed over unarmed men, the violence of troops, by means of which men are carried away from their labor, and the land, and the productions of labor, taken away from men.

As long as there is an armed man with the acknowledgment of his right to kill another man, whoever he may be, so long will there also exist an unjust distribution of wealth, — in other words, slavery.

CHAPTER XXII

I ALWAYS wonder at the often repeated words, "Yes, it is all true in theory, but how is it in practice?" As though this theory was a mere collection of good words, needful for conversation, and not as though all practice — that is, all activity of life — was inevitably based upon it.

There must have been in the world an immense number of foolish theories, if men employed such wonderful reasoning.

You know that theory is what a man thinks about a thing, and practice is what he does. How can it be that a man should think that he ought to act in one way, and then do quite the reverse? If the theory of baking bread consists in this, that first of all one must knead the dough, then put it by to rise, then any one knowing this would be a fool to do the reverse. But with us it has come into fashion to say, "All this is very well in theory, but how would it be in practice?"

In all that has occupied me, practice has unavoidably followed theory, not mainly in order to justify it, but because it cannot help doing so; if I have understood the affair upon which I have meditated, I cannot help doing it in the way in which I have understood it.

I wished to help the needy, only because I had money

to spare; and I shared the general superstition that money is the representative of labor, and, generally speaking, something lawful and good in itself. But, having begun to give this money away, I saw that I was only drawing bills of exchange collected by me from poor people; that I was doing the very thing the old landlords used to do in compelling some of their serfs to work for other serfs.

I saw that every use of money, whether buying anything with it, or giving it away gratis, is a drawing of bills of exchange on poor people, or passing them to others to be drawn by them. And therefore I clearly understood the foolishness of what I was doing, in helping the poor by exacting money from them.

I saw that money in itself was not only not a good thing, but obviously an evil one, depriving men of their chief good, labor, and the utilizing of their labor, and that this very good I cannot give to any one, because I am myself deprived of it: I have neither labor, nor the happiness of utilizing my labor.

It might be asked by some, "What is there so peculiarly important in abstractly discussing the meaning of money?" But this argument which I have opened, is not merely for the sake of discussion, but in order to find an answer to the vital question, which had caused me so much suffering, and on which my life depended, in order to discover what I was to do.

As soon as I understood what riches are, what money is, at once it became plain and unquestionable to me what all men must do. In reality I merely came to realize what I have long known,—that truth which has been transmitted to men from the oldest times, by Buddha, by Isaiah, by Laotse, and by Socrates, and particularly clearly and definitely by Jesus Christ, and His predecessor John the Baptist.

John the Baptist, in answer to men's question, "What shall we do, then?" answered plainly and briefly, "He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do likewise." (Luke iii. 10, 11.)

The same thing, and with still greater clearness, said Christ, — blessing the poor, and uttering woes on the rich. He said that no man can serve God and mammon.

He forbade His disciples not only to take money, but also to have two coats. He said to the rich young man that he could not enter into the kingdom of God, because he was rich, and that it is easier for a camel to go through the needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.

He said that he who would not leave everything — his houses and children and his fields — in order to follow Him, was not His disciple. He spoke a parable about a rich man who had done nothing wrong (like our own rich people), but merely dressed well, ate and drank well, yet by this lost his own soul; and about a beggar named Lazarus, who had done nothing good, and who had saved his soul by his beggar's life.

This truth had long been known to me; but the false teaching of the world had so cunningly hidden it, that it became a theory in the sense which men like to attach to this word, — that is, a pure abstraction. But as soon as I succeeded in pulling down in my consciousness the sophistry of the world's teaching, then theory became one with practice, and the reality of my life became its unavoidable result.

I understood that man, besides living for his own good, must work for the good of others; that if we were to draw our comparison from the world of animals, as some men are so fond of doing in justifying violence and contest by the law of the struggle for existence, we must take this comparison also from the lives of social animals like bees; and therefore man, saying nothing of his love to his neighbors incumbent upon him, as well by reason as by his very nature, is called upon to serve his fellows and their common object.

I understood that this is the natural law of man, by fulfilling which he can alone fulfil his calling, and therefore be happy. I understood that this law has been and is being violated by the fact that men by violence (as robber-bees) free themselves from labor, and utilize the

labor of others, using this labor not for the common purpose, but for the personal satisfaction of their constantly increasing lusts, and also, like robber-bees, they perish thereby. I understood that the misfortune of men comes from the slavery in which some men are kept by others. I understood that this slavery is brought about in our days by the violence of military force, by the appropriation of land, and by the exaction of money.

And, having understood the meaning of all these three instruments of modern slavery, I could not help desiring to free myself from any share in it.

When I was a landlord, possessing serfs, and came to understand the immorality of such a position, I, along with other men who had understood the same thing, tried to free myself from it. Failing to do so, I endeavored to assert my claims as a slaveowner as little as possible, and to live, and to let other people live, as if such claims did not exist, and at the same time, by trying every means, to suggest to other slaveowners the unlawfulness and inhumanity of their imaginary rights.

I cannot help doing the same now with reference to existent slavery; that is, I try as little as possible to assert my claims while I am unable to free myself from such power of claim which gives me landownership and money, raised by the violence of military force, and at the same time by all means in my power to try to suggest to other men the unlawfulness and inhumanity of these imaginary rights.

The share in enslaving men, from the standpoint of a slaveowner, consists in utilizing the labor of others; it is quite the same, whether the enslaving is based upon a claim to the person of the slave, or upon the possession of land or money. And therefore, if a man really does not like slavery, and does not desire to be a partaker in it, the first thing which he must do is this: neither utilize men's labor by serving the government, nor possess land or money.

The refusal of all the means in use for utilizing another's labor will unavoidably bring such a man to the necessity, on the one hand, of lessening his wants,

and, on the other, of doing himself what formerly was done for him by others. And this so simple inference at once puts an end to all three causes which prevent our helping the poor, which I discovered in seeking the cause of my non-success.

The first cause was the accumulation of people in towns, and the absorption there of the productions of the country.

All that a man needs is not to desire to utilize another's labor by serving the government, possessing land and money, and then, according to his strength and ability, to satisfy unaided his own wants, and the idea of leaving his village would never enter his mind, because in the country it is easier for him personally to satisfy his wants, while in a town everything is the production of the labor of others; in the country a man will always be able to help the needy, and will not experience that feeling of being useless which I felt in the town when I wanted to help men, not with my own, but with other men's labors.

The second cause was the estrangement between the poor and the rich. A man need only not desire to utilize other men's labor by serving the government, possessing land and money, and he would be compelled himself to satisfy his wants, and at once involuntarily that barrier would be pushed down which separates him from the working-people, and he would be one with the people, standing shoulder to shoulder with them, and seeing the possibility of helping them.

The third cause was shame, based upon the consciousness of the immorality of possessing money with which I wanted to help others. A man needs only not to desire to utilize another man's labor by serving the government, possessing land and money, and he will never have that superfluous "fool's money," the fact of possessing which made those who wanted money ask me for pecuniary assistance, which I was not able to satisfy, and called forth in me the consciousness of my unrighteousness.

CHAPTER XXIII

I SAW that the cause of the sufferings and depravity of men lies in the fact that some men are in bondage to others; and therefore I came to the obvious conclusion that if I want to help men, I have first of all to leave off causing those very misfortunes which I want to remedy,—in other words, I must not share in the enslaving of men.

I was led to the enslaving of men by the circumstance that from my infancy I had been accustomed not to work, but to utilize the labor of others, and I have been living in a society which is not only accustomed to this slavery, but justifies it by all kinds of sophistry, clever and foolish.

I came to the following simple conclusion, that, in order to avoid causing the sufferings and depravity of men, I ought to make other men work for me as little as possible, and to work myself as much as possible.

It was by this roundabout way that I arrived at the inevitable conclusion at which the Chinese arrived some thousand years ago, and which they express thus: "If there is one idle man, there must be another who is starving."

I came to that simple and natural conclusion, that if I pity the exhausted horse on whose back I ride, the first thing for me to do, if I really pity him, is to get off him and walk. This answer which gives such complete satisfaction to the moral sense, has been always before my eyes, as it is before the eyes of every one, but we do not all see it.

In seeking to heal our social diseases we look everywhere,—in the governmental, anti-governmental, scientific, and philanthropic superstitions,—and yet we do not see that which meets the eyes of every one. We fill our drains with filth, and require other men to clean them, and pretend to be very sorry for them, and we want to ease their work, and are inventing all sorts of devices except one, the simplest; namely, that we should

ourselves remove our slops so long as we find it necessary to produce them in our rooms.

For one who really suffers from the sufferings of other men surrounding him, there exists a most clear, simple, and easy means, the only one sufficient to heal this evil, and to confer a sense of the lawfulness of one's life. This means is that which John the Baptist recommended when he answered the question, "What shall we do, then?" and which was confirmed by Christ, not to have more than one coat, and not to possess money, — that is, not to profit by another man's labor; and in order not to utilize another's labor, we must do with our own hands all that we can do. This is so plain and simple! But this is plain and simple and clear, only when our wants are also plain, and when we ourselves are still sound, and not corrupted to the backbone by idleness and laziness.

I live in a village, lie by the stove, and tell my neighbor, who is my debtor, to light it. It is obvious that I am lazy, take my neighbor away from his own work, and I at last feel ashamed of it; and besides, it grows dull for me to be always lying down when my muscles are strong and accustomed to work, and I go to fetch the wood myself.

But slavery of all kinds has been going on so long, so many artificial wants have grown about it, so many people with different degrees of familiarity with these wants are interwoven one with another, through so many generations men have been spoiled and made effeminate, such complicated temptations and justifications of luxury and idleness have been invented by men, that for one who stands on the top of the pyramid of idle men, it is not at all so easy to understand his sin as it is for the peasant who compels his neighbor to light his stove.

Men who stand at the top find it most difficult to understand what is required of them. They become giddy from the height of the structure of lies on which they stand when they look at that spot on the earth to which they must descend, in order to begin to live, not right-

eously, but only not quite inhumanly ; and that is why this plain and clear truth appears to these men so strange.

A man who employs ten servants in livery, coachmen and cooks, who has pictures and pianos, must certainly regard as strange and even ridiculous the simple preliminary duty of, I do not say a good man, but of every man who is not a beast, to hew that wood with which his food is cooked and by which he is warmed ; to clean those boots in which he carelessly stepped into the mud ; to bring that water with which he keeps himself clean, and to carry away those slops in which he has washed himself.

But besides the estrangement of men from the truth, there is another cause which hinders men from seeing the duty of doing the most simple and natural physical work ; that is, the complicity and interweaving of the conditions in which a rich man lives.

This morning I entered the corridor in which the stoves are heated. A peasant was heating the stove which warmed my son's room. I entered his bedroom : he was asleep, and it was eleven o'clock in the morning. The excuse was, "To-day is a holiday ; no lessons." A stout lad of eighteen years of age, having overeaten himself the previous night, is sleeping until eleven o'clock ; and a peasant of his age, who had already that morning done a quantity of work, was now lighting the tenth stove. "It would be better, perhaps, if the peasant did not light the stove to warm this stout, lazy fellow !" thought I ; but I remembered at once that this stove also warmed the room of our housekeeper, a woman of forty years of age, who had been working the night before till three o'clock in the morning, to prepare everything for the supper which my son ate ; and then she put away the dishes, and, notwithstanding this, got up at seven.

She cannot heat the stove herself : she has no time for that. The peasant is heating the stove for her too. And under her name my lazy fellow is being warmed.

True, the advantages of all are interwoven ; but without much consideration the conscience of each will say,

On whose side is the labor, and on whose the idleness? But not only does conscience tell this, the account-book also tells it: the more money one spends, the more people work. The less one spends, the more one works one's self. My luxurious life gives means of living to others. Where should my old footman go, if I were to discharge him? What! every one must do everything for himself? Make his coat as well as hew his wood? And how about a division of labor? And industry and social undertakings? And, last of all, come the most horrible of words, — civilization, science, art!

CHAPTER XXIV

LAST March I was returning home late in the evening. On turning into a by-lane, I perceived on the snow, in a distant field, some black shadows. I should not have noticed this but for the policeman, who stood at the end of the lane, and cried in the direction of the shadows, "Vasili, why don't you come along?"

"She won't move," answered a voice; and thereupon the shadows came toward the policeman. I stopped and asked him: —

"What is the matter?"

He said, "We have got some girls from Rzhanoff's house, and are taking them to the police station; and one of them lags behind, and won't come along."

A night-watchman in sheepskin coat appeared now, leading a girl who slouched along, while he prodded her from behind. I, the watchman, and the policeman were wearing winter coats; she alone had none, having only her gown on. In the dark, I could distinguish only a brown dress, and a kerchief round her head and neck. She was short, like most starvelings, and had a broad, clumsy figure.

"We are n't going to stay here all night for you, you hag! Get on, or I'll give it you!" shouted the policeman. He was evidently fatigued, and tired of her. She walked some paces, and stopped again.

The old watchman, a good-natured man (I knew him) pulled her by the hand. "I'll wake you up! come along!" said he, pretending to be angry. She staggered, and began to speak, with a creaking, hoarse voice: "Let me be; don't you push. I'll get on myself."

"You'll be frozen to death," he returned.

"A girl like me won't be frozen; I've lots of hot blood."

She meant it as a joke, but her words sounded like a curse. By a lamp which stood not far from the gate of my house, she stopped again, leaned back against the paling, and began to seek for something among her petticoats with awkward, frozen hands. They again shouted to her; but she only muttered, and continued searching. She held in one hand a crumpled cigarette, and matches in the other. I remained behind her; I was ashamed to pass by, or to stay and look at her. But I made up my mind, and came up to her. She leaned with her shoulder against the paling, and vainly tried to light a match on it.

I looked narrowly at her face. She was indeed a starveling, and appeared to me to be a woman of about thirty. Her complexion was dirty; her eyes small, dim, and bleared with drinking; she had a squat nose; her lips were wry and slaving, with downcast angles; from under her kerchief fell a tuft of dry hair. Her figure was long and flat; her arms and legs short.

I stopped in front of her. She looked at me and smiled, as if she knew all that I was thinking about. I felt that I ought to say something to her. I wanted to show her that I pitied her.

"Have you parents?" I asked. She laughed hoarsely, then suddenly stopped, and, lifting her brows, began to look at me steadfastly.

"Have you parents?" I repeated.

She smiled with a grimace which seemed to say, "What a question for him to put!"

"I have a mother," she said at last; "but what's that to you?"

"And how old are you?"

"I am over fifteen," said she, at once answering a question she was accustomed to hear.

"Come, come! go on; we shall all be frozen for you; the deuce take you!" shouted the policeman; and she edged off from the paling, and staggered on along the lane to the police station; and I turned to the gate, and entered my house, and asked whether my daughters were at home. I was told that they had been to an evening party, had enjoyed themselves much, and now were asleep.

The next morning I was about to go to the police station to inquire what had become of this unhappy girl; and I was ready to start early enough, when one of those unfortunate men called, who from weakness have dropped out of the gentlemanly line of life to which they have been accustomed, and who rise and fall by turns. I had been acquainted with him three years. During this time he had several times sold everything he had,—even his clothes; and, having just done so again, he passed his nights temporarily in Rzhanoff's house, and his days at my lodgings. He met me as I was going out, and without listening to me, began at once to tell me what had happened at Rzhanoff's house the night before.

He began to relate it, yet had not got through one-half, when, all of a sudden, he, an old man who had gone through much in his life, began to sob, and ceasing to speak turned his face away from me. This was what he related. I ascertained the truth of his story on the spot, where I learned some new particulars, which I shall relate too.

A washerwoman thirty years of age, fair, quiet, good-looking, but delicate, passed her nights in that night-lodging on the ground floor in No. 32, where my friend slept among various shifting night-lodgers, men and women, who for five kopeks slept with each other.

The landlady at this lodging was the mistress of a boatman. In summer her lover kept a boat, and in winter they earned their living by letting lodgings to night-

lodgers, at three kopeks without a pillow, and at five kopeks with one.

The washerwoman had been living here some months, and was a quiet woman; but lately they began to object to her because she coughed and prevented the other lodgers from sleeping. An old woman in particular, eighty years old, half silly, and also a permanent inmate of this lodging, began to dislike the washerwoman, and kept annoying her, because she disturbed her sleep; for all night she coughed like a sheep.

The washerwoman said nothing. She owed for rent, and felt herself guilty, and was therefore compelled to endure. She began to work less and less, for her strength failed her; and that was why she was unable to pay her rent. She had not been to work at all the whole of the last week; and she had been making the lives of all, and particularly of the old woman, miserable by her cough.

Four days ago the landlady gave her notice to leave. She already owed sixty kopeks, and could not pay them, and there was no hope of doing so; and other lodgers complained of her cough.

When the landlady gave the washerwoman notice, and told her she must go away if she did not pay the rent, the old woman was glad, and pushed her out into the yard. The washerwoman went away, but came back again in an hour, and the landlady had not the heart to send her away again. . . . During the second and the third day the landlady left her there. "Where shall I go?" she kept saying. On the third day, the landlady's lover, a Moscow man, who knew all the rules and regulations, went for a policeman. The policeman, with a sword and a pistol slung on a red cord, came into the lodging, and quietly and politely turned the washerwoman out into the street.

It was a bright, sunny, but frosty day in March. The melting snow ran down in streams, the house-porters were breaking the ice. The hackney sledges bumped on the ice-glazed snow, and creaked over the stones. The washerwoman went up the hill on the sunny side,

got to the church, and sat down in the sun at the church-porch. But when the sun began to go down behind the houses, and the pools of water began to be covered over with a thin sheet of ice, the washerwoman felt chilly and terrified. She got up and slowly walked on. . . . Where? Home,—to the only house in which she had been living lately.

While she was walking there, several times resting herself, it began to get dark. She approached the gate, turned into it, her foot slipped, she gave a shriek, and fell down.

One man passed by, then another. "She must be drunk," they thought. Another man passed, and stumbled up against her, and said to the house-porter, "Some tipsy woman is lying at the gate. I very nearly broke my neck over her. Won't you take her away?"

The house-porter came. The washerwoman was dead. Such was what my friend related to me.

The reader will perhaps fancy I have picked out particular cases in the prostitute of fifteen years of age and the story of this washerwoman; but let him not think so: this really happened in one and the same night. I do not exactly remember the date, only it was in March, 1884.

Having heard my friend's story, I went to the police station, intending from there to go to Rzhanoff's house to learn all the particulars of the washerwoman's story.

The weather was fine and sunny; and again under the ice of the previous night, in the shade, you could see the water running; and in the sun, in the square, everything was melting fast. The trees of the garden appeared blue from over the river; the sparrows that were reddish in winter, and unnoticed then, now attracted people's attention by their merriness; men also tried to be merry, but they all had too many cares. The bells of the churches sounded; and blending with them from the barracks were heard sounds of shooting,—the hiss of the rifle-balls, and the crack when they struck the target.

I entered the police station. There some armed

men — policemen — led me to their chief. He, also armed with a sword, saber, and pistol, was busy giving some orders about a ragged, trembling old man who was standing before him and from weakness could not clearly answer what was asked of him. Having done with the old man, he turned to me. I inquired about the girl of last night. He first listened to me attentively, then he smiled, not only because I did not know why they were taken to the police station, but more particularly at my astonishment at her youth. "Goodness! there are some of twelve, thirteen, and fourteen years of age often," said he, in a lively tone.

To my question about my friend of yesterday, he told me that she had probably been already sent to the committee (if I understood him right). To my question where such passed the night, he gave a vague answer. The one about whom I spoke he did not remember. There were so many of them every day.

At Rzhanoff's house, in No. 32, I already found the clerk reading prayers over the dead laundrywoman. She had been brought in and laid on her former pallet; and the lodgers, all starvelings themselves, contributed money for the prayers, the coffin, and the shroud; the old woman had dressed her, and laid her out. The clerk was reading something in the dark; a woman in a cloak stood holding a wax taper; and with a similar wax taper stood a man (a gentleman, it is fair to state), in a nice greatcoat, trimmed with an Astrachan collar, in bright goloshes, and he had on a starched shirt. That was her brother. He had been hunted up.

I passed by the dead to the landlady's room, in order to ask her all the particulars. She was afraid of my questions, — afraid probably of being charged with something; but by and by she grew talkative, and told me all. On passing by again, I looked at the dead body. All the dead are beautiful; but this one was particularly so, and touching in her coffin, with her clear, pale face, with closed, swollen eyes, sunken cheeks, and fair, soft hair over her high forehead; her face looked weary, but kind, and not sad at all, but rather astonished. And

indeed, if the living do not see, the dead may well be astonished.

On the day I wrote this, there was a great ball in Moscow. On the same night I left home after eight o'clock. I live in a locality surrounded by factories; and I left home after the factory whistle had sounded, and when, after a week of incessant work, people were freed for their holiday. Factory men passed by me, and I by them, all turning their steps to the public houses and inns. Many were already tipsy; many more were with women.

Every morning at five I hear each of the whistles, which means that the labor of women, children, and old people has begun. At eight o'clock another whistle, —this means half an hour's rest; at twelve the third whistle, —this means an hour for dinner. At eight o'clock the fourth whistle, indicating cessation from work. By a strange coincidence, all the three factories in my neighborhood produce only the articles necessary for balls.

In one factory — the one nearest to me — they make nothing but stockings; in the other opposite, silk stuffs; in the third, perfumes and pomades.

One may, on hearing these whistles, attach to them no other meaning than that of the indication of time. "There, the whistle has sounded: it is time to go out for a walk."

But one may associate with them also the meaning they in reality have,—that at the first whistle at five o'clock in the morning, men and women, who have slept side by side in a damp cellar, get up in the dark, and hurry away into the noisy building, and take their part in a work of which they see neither cessation nor utility for themselves, and work often so in the heat, in suffocating exhalations, with very rare intervals of rest, for one, two, or three, or even twelve and more hours. They fall asleep, and get up again, and again do this work, meaningless for themselves, to which they are compelled exclusively by want. And so it goes on from one week to another, interrupted only by holidays.

And now I saw these working-people freed for one of these holidays. They go out into the street; everywhere there are inns, public houses, and gay women. And they, in a drunken state, pull each other by the arms, and carry along with them girls like the one whom I saw conducted to the police station; they hire hackney-coaches, and ride and walk from one inn to another, and abuse each other, and totter about, and say they know not what.

Formerly, when I saw the factory people knocking about in this way, I used to turn aside with disgust, and almost reproached them; but since I hear these daily whistles, and know what they mean, I am only astonished that all these men do not come into the condition of utter beggars, with whom Moscow is filled; and the women into the position of the girl whom I had met near my house.

Thus I walked on, looking at these men, observing how they went about the streets till eleven o'clock. Then their movements became quieter; there remained here and there a few tipsy people, and I met some men and women who were being conducted to the police station. And now, from every side, carriages appeared, all going in one direction. On the coach-box sat a coachman, sometimes in a sheepskin coat; and a footman — a dandy with a cockade. Well-fed trotters, covered with cloth, ran at the rate of fifteen miles an hour; in the carriages sat ladies wrapped in shawls, and taking great care not to spoil their flowers and their toilets. All, beginning with the harness on the horses, carriages, gutta-percha wheels, the cloth of the coachman's coat, down to the stockings, shoes, flowers, velvet, gloves, scents,—all these articles have been made by those men, some of whom fell asleep on their own pallets in their mean rooms, some in night-houses with prostitutes, and others in the police station.

The ball-goers drive past these men, in and with things made by them; and it does not even enter into their minds that there could possibly be any connection between the ball they are going to and these tipsy peo-

ple, to whom their coachmen shout out so angrily. With quite easy minds, and assurance that they are doing nothing wrong, they enjoy themselves at the ball.

Enjoy themselves!

From eleven o'clock in the evening till six in the morning, in the very depth of the night, while with empty stomachs men are lying in night-lodgings, or dying as the washerwoman had done!

The enjoyment of the ball consists in women and girls uncovering their bosoms, putting on artificial protuberances, and altogether getting themselves up in a way that no girl and no woman who is not yet depraved would, on any account, appear before men; and in this half-naked condition, with uncovered bosoms, and arms bare up to the shoulders, with dresses puffed behind and tight round the hips, in the brightest light, women and girls, whose first virtue has always been modesty, appear among strange men, who are also dressed in indecently tight-fitting clothes, and with them, to the sound of exciting music, embrace each other, and pivot round and round. Old women, often also half-naked like the younger ones, are sitting looking on, and eating and drinking; the old men do the same. No wonder it is done at night, when every one else is sleeping, so that no one may see it!

But this is not done in order to hide it; there is nothing indeed to hide; all is very nice and good; and by this enjoyment, in which is swallowed up the painful labor of thousands, not only is nobody harmed, but by this very thing poor people are fed! The ball goes on very merrily, maybe, but how did it come to do so? When we see in society or among ourselves one who has not eaten, or is cold, we are ashamed to enjoy ourselves, and cannot begin to be merry until he is fed, saying nothing of the fact that we cannot imagine that there are such people who can enjoy themselves by means of anything which produces the sufferings of others.

We are disgusted, and we do not understand the enjoyment of naughty boys who have squeezed a dog's

tail into a piece of split wood. How is it, then, that in our enjoyments we become blind, and do not see that cleft in which we have pinched those men who suffer for our enjoyment?

We know that each woman at this ball whose dress costs a hundred and fifty rubles was not born at the ball, but she has lived also in the country, has seen peasants, knows her own nurse and maid, whose fathers and brothers are poor, for whom earning one hundred and fifty rubles to build a cottage with is the end and aim of a long, laborious life; she knows this; how can she, then, enjoy herself, knowing that on her half-naked body she is wearing the cottage which is the dream of her housemaid's brother?

But let us suppose she has not thought about this: she cannot help knowing that velvet and silk, sweet-meats and flowers, and laces and dresses, do not grow of themselves, but are made by men.

It would seem she could not help knowing that men make all this, and under what circumstances, and why. She cannot help knowing that her dressmaker, whom she has been scolding to-day, has made this dress not at all out of love to her, therefore she cannot help knowing that all those things were made — her laces, flowers, and velvet — from sheer want.

But perhaps she is so blinded that she does not think of all this. Well, but, at all events, she could not help knowing that five people, old, respectable, often delicate men and women, have not slept all night, and have been busy on her account. This, also, she could not help knowing, — that on this night there were twenty-eight degrees of frost, and that her coachman — an old man — was sitting in this frost all night, upon his coach-box.

If these young women and girls, from the hypnotic influence of the ball, fail to see all this, we cannot judge them. Poor things! they consider all to be good which is pronounced so by their elders. How do these elders explain their cruelty? They, indeed, always answer in the same way: "I compel no one; what I have,

I have bought ; footmen, chambermaids, coachman, I hire. There is no harm in engaging and in buying. I compel none ; I hire ; what wrong is there in that ? ”

Some days ago I called on a friend. Passing through the first room, I wondered at seeing at a table two females, for I knew my acquaintance was a bachelor. A skinny, yellow, elderly-looking woman, about thirty, with a kerchief thrown over her shoulder, was briskly doing something over the table with her hands, jerking nervously, as if in a fit. Opposite to her sat a little girl, who was also doing something, jerking in the same way. They both seemed to be suffering from St. Vitus's dance. I came nearer and looked closer to see what they were about.

They glanced up at me, and then continued their work as attentively as before.

Before them were spread tobacco and cigarettes. They were making cigarettes. The woman rubbed the tobacco fine between the palms of her hands, caught it up by a machine, put on the tubes, and threw them to the girl. The girl folded the papers, put them over the cigarette, threw it aside, and took up another.

All this was performed with such speed, with such dexterity, that it was impossible to describe it. I expressed my wonder at their quickness. “ I have been at this business fourteen years,” said the woman.

“ Is it hard work ? ”

“ Yes ; my chest aches, and the air is choky with tobacco.”

But it was not necessary for her to have said so : you need only have looked at her or at the girl. The latter had been at this business three years ; but any one not seeing her at this work would have said that she had a strong constitution, which was already beginning to be broken.

My acquaintance, a kind-hearted man of liberal views, hired these women to make him cigarettes at two rubles and a half a thousand. He has money, and he pays it away for this work : what harm is there in it ?

My acquaintance gets up at twelve. His evenings,

from six to two, he spends at cards or at the piano; he eats and drinks; other people do all the work for him. He has devised for himself a new pleasure, — smoking. I can remember when he began to smoke. Here are a woman and a girl, who scarcely earn their living by transforming themselves into machines, and pass all their lives in breathing tobacco, thus ruining their lives. He has money which he has not earned, and he prefers playing at cards to making cigarettes for himself. He gives these women money, only under the condition that they continue to live as miserably as they have been living, in making cigarettes for him.

I am fond of cleanliness; and I give money, only under the condition that the washerwoman washes my shirts, which I change twice a day; and the washing of these shirts having taxed the utmost strength of the washerwoman, she has died.

What is wrong in this?

Men who buy and hire will continue doing so whether I do or not; they will force other people to make velvets and dainties, and will buy them whether I do or not; so also they will hire people to make cigarettes and to wash shirts. Why should I, then, deprive myself of velvets, sweetmeats, cigarettes, and clean shirts, when their production is already set in going.

A crowd, maddened with the passion of destruction, will employ this very reasoning. It leads a pack of dogs, when one of their number runs against another and knocks it down, to attack it and tear it to pieces. Others have already begun, have done a little mischief; why should n't I, too, do the same? What can it possibly signify if I wear a dirty shirt, and make my cigarettes myself? Could that help any one? Ask men who desire to justify themselves.

Had we not wandered so far from truth, it would be needless to answer this question; but we are so entangled that such a question seems natural to us, and, therefore, though I feel ashamed, I must answer it.

What difference would it be if I should wear my shirt

a week instead of one day, and make my cigarettes myself, or leave off smoking altogether?

The difference would be this; — that a certain washer-woman, and a certain cigarette-maker, would exert themselves less, and what I gave formerly for the washing of my shirt, and for the making of my cigarettes, I may give now to that or to another woman; and working-people who are tired by their work, instead of overworking themselves, will be able to rest and to have tea. But I have heard objections to this, so averse are the rich and the luxurious to understand their position.

They reply, "If I should wear dirty linen, leave off smoking, and give this money away to the poor, then this money would be all the same taken away from them, and my drop will not help to swell the sea."

I am still more ashamed to answer such a reply, but at the same time I must do so. If I came among savages who gave me chops which I thought delicious, but the next day I learned (perhaps saw, myself) that these delicious chops were made of a human prisoner who had been slain in order to make them; and if I think it bad to eat men, however delicious the cutlets may be, and however general the custom to eat men among the persons with whom I live, and however small the utility to the prisoners who have been prepared for food my refusal to eat them may be, I shall not and will not eat them.

Maybe I shall eat human flesh when urged by hunger; but I shall not make a feast of it, and shall not take part in feasts with human flesh, and shall not seek such feasts, and be proud of my partaking of them.

CHAPTER XXV

BUT what is to be done, then? Is it we who are to blame? And if not, who is?

We say, It is not we who have done all this; it has been done of itself; as children say when they break

anything, that it broke itself. We say that as towns are already in existence, we, who are living there, must feed men by buying their labor. But that is not true. It need only be observed how we live in the country, and how we feed people there.

Winter is over; Easter is past. In town the same orgies of the rich go on, — on the boulevards, in gardens, in the parks, on the river, music, theaters, riding, illuminations, fireworks; but in the country it is still better, — the air is purer; the trees, the meadows, the flowers, are fresher. We must go where all is budding and blooming. And now the majority of rich people, who utilize other men's labor, go into the country to breathe the purer air, to look at the meadows and woods. And here in the country among humble villagers, who feed upon bread and onions, work eighteen hours every day, and have neither sufficient sleep nor clothes, rich people take up their abode. No one tempts these people: here are no factories, and no idle hands, of which there are so many in town, and which we imagine we feed by giving them work to do. Here people never can do their own work in time during the summer; and not only are there no idle hands, but much property is lost for want of hands; and an immense number of men, children, old people, and women with child overwork themselves.

How, then, do rich people order their lives here? Thus: If there happens to be an old mansion, built in the time of the serfs, then this house is renewed and embellished, if there is not, one is built of two or three stories. The rooms, which are from twelve to twenty and more in number, are all about sixteen feet high. The floors are inlaid; in the windows are put single panes of glass, expensive carpets on the floors; expensive furniture is procured, — a sideboard, for instance, costing from twenty to sixty pounds. Near the mansion, roads are made; flower-beds are laid out; there are croquet-grounds, giant-strides, reflecting-globes, conservatories, and hothouses, and always luxurious stables. All is painted in colors, prepared with the very oil which old people and children lack for their porridge. If a rich man

can afford it he buys such a house for himself ; if he cannot, he hires one ; but however poor and however liberal a man of our circle may be, he always takes up his abode in the country in such a house, for building and keeping which it is necessary to take away dozens of working-people who have not enough time to do their own business in the field in order to earn their living.

Here we cannot say that factories are already in existence and will continue so, whether we made use of their work or no ; we cannot say that we are feeding idle hands ; here we plainly establish the factories for making things necessary for us, and simply make use of the surrounding people ; we divert the people from work necessary for them, as for us and for all, and by such system deprave some and ruin the lives and health of others.

There lives, let us say, in a village, an educated and respectable family of the upper class, or that of a government officer. All the members of it and the visitors assemble toward the middle of June, because up to June they had been studying and passing their examinations : they assemble when mowing begins, and they stay until September, until the harvest and sowing time. The members of the family (as almost all men of this class) remain in the country from the beginning of the urgent work, — harvest-time, — not to the end of it, indeed, because in September the sowing goes on, and the digging up of potatoes, but till labor begins to slacken. During all the time of their stay, around them and close by, the peasants' summer work has been proceeding, the strain of which, however much we may have heard or read of it, however much we may have looked at it, we can form no adequate idea of without having experienced it ourselves.

And the members of the family, about ten persons, have been living as they did in town, if possible still worse than in town, because here in the village they are supposed to be resting (after doing nothing), and offer no pretense in the way of work, and no excuse for their idleness.

In the middle of the summer, when people are forced from want to feed on kvas, and bread and onions, begins the mowing-time. Gentlefolks, who live in the country, see this labor, partly order it, partly admire it; enjoy the smell of the drying hay, the sound of the women's songs, the noise of the scythes, and the sight of the rows of mowers and of the women raking. They see this as well near their house as when they, with young people and children, who do nothing all the day long, drive well-fed horses a distance of a few hundred yards to the bathing-place.

The work of mowing is one of the most important in the world. Nearly every year, from want of hands and of time, the meadows remain half cut, and may remain so till the rains begin; so that the degree of intensity of the labor decides the question whether twenty or more per cent will be added to the stores of men, or whether this hay will be left to rot and spoil while yet uncut.

And if there is more hay, there will be also more meat for old people, and milk for children; thus matters stand in general; but in particular for each mower here is decided the question of bread and milk for himself and for his children during the winter.

Each of the working-people, male and female, knows it; even the children know that this is an important business, and that one ought to work with all one's strength, carry a jug with kvas for the father to the mowing-place, and, shifting it from one hand to another, run barefoot as quickly as possible, a distance of perhaps a mile and a half from the village, in order to be in time for dinner, that father may not grumble. Every one knows that, from the mowing to the harvest, there will be no interruption of labor, and no time for rest. And besides mowing, each has some other business to do,—to plow up new land, and to harrow it; the women have cloth to make, bread to bake, and the washing to do; and the peasants must drive to the mill and to market; they have the official affairs of their community to attend to; they have also to provide the local govern-

ment officials with means of locomotion, and to pass the night in the fields with the pastured horses.

All, old and young and sick, work with all their strength.

The peasants work in such a way that, when cutting the last rows, the mowers—weak people, growing youths, old men—are so tired that, having rested a little, it is with great pain they begin anew; the women, often with child, work hard too.

It is a strained, incessant labor. All work to the utmost of their strength, and use not only all their provisions, but what they have in store: during harvest-time all the peasants grow thinner, although they never were very stout.

There is a small company laboring in the hayfield, three peasants,—one of them an old man; another his nephew, who is married; and the third the village bootmaker, a thin, wiry man. Their mowing this morning decides their fate for the coming winter, whether they will be able to keep a cow and pay taxes. This is their second week's work. The rain hindered them for a while. After the rain had left off, and the water had dried up, they decided on making hayricks; and in order to do it quicker, they decided that two women must rake to each scythe. With the old man came out his wife, fifty years of age, worn out with labor and the bearing of eleven children, deaf, but still strong enough for work; and his daughter, thirteen years of age, a short but brisk and strong little girl.

With the nephew came his wife,—a tall woman, as strong as a peasant; and his sister-in-law,—a soldier's wife, who was with child. With the bootmaker came his wife,—a strong working-woman; and her mother,—an old woman about eighty, who for the rest of the year used to beg.

They all draw up in a line, and work from morning to evening in the burning sun of June. It is steaming hot, and a thunder-shower is threatening. Every moment of work is precious. They have not wished to leave off working, even in order to fetch water or kvas

A small boy, the grandson of the old woman, brings them water. The old woman is evidently anxious only on one point,—not to be obliged to cease working. She does not let the rake out of her hands, and moves about with great difficulty. The little boy, quite bent under the jug with water, heavier than he himself, walks with short steps on his bare feet, and carries the jug, with many shifts. The little girl takes on her shoulders a load of hay, which is also heavier than herself; walks a few paces, and stops, then throws it down, having no strength to carry it farther. The old man's wife rakes together unceasingly, her kerchief loosened from her disordered hair: she carries the hay, breathing heavily, and staggering under the burden; the cobbler's mother is only raking, but this also is beyond her strength; she slowly drags her ill-shod feet, and looks gloomily before her, like one at the point of death. The old man purposely sends her far away from the others, to rake about the ricks, in order that she may not attempt to compete with them; but she does not leave off working, but continues with the same dead, gloomy face as long as the others.

The sun is already setting behind the wood, and the ricks are not yet in order; there is much still to be done.

All feel that it is time to leave off working, but no one says so, each waiting for the other to suggest it. At last, the bootmaker, realizing that he has no more strength left, proposes to the old man to leave the ricks till to-morrow, and the old man agrees to it; and at once the women go to fetch their clothes, their jugs, their pitch-forks; and the old woman sits down where she was standing, and then lays herself down with the same fixed stare on her face. But as the women go away, she gets up groaning, and, crawling along, follows them.

Let us turn to the country-house. The same evening, when from the side of the village were heard the rattle of the scythes of the toil-worn mowers who were returning from work, the sounds of the hammer against the anvil, the cries of women and girls who had just had

time to put away their rakes, and were already running to drive the cattle in, — with these blend other sounds from the country-house. Drin, drin, drin! goes the piano; a Hungarian song is heard through the noise of the croquet-balls; before the stable an open carriage is standing, harnessed with four fat horses, which has been hired for twenty shillings to bring some guests a distance of ten miles.

Horses standing by the carriage rattle their little bells. Before them hay has been thrown, which they are scattering with their hoofs, the same hay which the peasants have been gathering with such hard labor. In the yard of this mansion there is movement; a healthy, well-fed fellow in a pink shirt, presented to him for his service as a house-porter, is calling the coachmen, and telling them to harness and saddle some horses. Two peasants, who live here as coachmen, come out of their room, and go in an easy manner, swinging their arms, to saddle horses for the ladies and gentlemen. Still nearer to the house the sounds of another piano are heard. It is the music-mistress, who lives in the family to teach the children, practising her Schumann. The sounds of one piano jangle with those of another. Quite near the house walk two nurses; one is young, another old; they lead and carry children to bed; these children are of the same age as those who ran from the village with jugs. One nurse is English: she cannot speak Russian. She was engaged to come from England, not from being distinguished by some peculiar qualities, but simply because she does not speak Russian. Farther on is another person, a Frenchwoman, who is also engaged because she does not know Russian. Farther on a peasant, with two women, is watering flowers near the house; another is cleaning a gun for one of the young gentlemen. Here two women are carrying a basket with clean linen, — they have been washing for all these gentlefolks. In the house two women have scarcely time to wash the plates and dishes after the company, who have just done eating; and two peasants in evening clothes are running up and down the stairs,

serving coffee, tea, wine, seltzer-water, etc. Up-stairs a table is spread. A meal has just ended; and another will soon begin, to continue till cock-crow, and often till morning dawns. Some are sitting smoking, playing cards; others are sitting and smoking, engaged in discoursing liberal ideas of reform; and others, again, walk to and fro, eat, smoke, and not knowing what to do, have made up their mind to take a drive.

The household consists of fifteen persons, healthy men and women; and thirty persons, healthy working-people, male and female, labor for them. And this takes place there, where every hour, and each little boy, are precious.

This will be so, also, in July, when the peasants, not having had their sleep out, will mow the oats at night, in order that it may not be lost, and the women will get up before dawn in order to finish their threshing in time; when this old woman, who had been exhausted during the harvest, and the woman with child, and the little children, all will again overwork themselves, and when there is a great want of hands, horses, carts, in order to house this corn upon which all men feed, of which millions of poods are necessary in Russia in order that men should not die: during even such a time, the idle lives of ladies and gentlemen will go on. There will be private theatricals, picnics, hunting, drinking, eating, piano-playing, singing, dancing,—in fact, incessant orgies.

Here, at least, it is impossible to find any excuse from the fact that all this had been going on before: nothing of the kind had been in existence. We ourselves carefully create such a life, taking bread and labor away from the work-worn people. We live sumptuously, as if there were no connection whatever between the dying washerwoman, child-prostitute, women worn out by making cigarettes, and by all the intense labor around us which is inadequate to their unnourished strength. We do not want to see the fact that if there were not our idle, luxurious, depraved lives, there would not be this labor disproportioned to the strength of people, and

that if there were not this labor we could not go on living in the same way.

It appears to us that their sufferings are one thing, and our lives another, and that we, living as we do, are innocent and pure as doves. We read the description of the lives of the Romans, and wonder at the inhumanity of a heartless Lucullus, who gorged himself with fine dishes and delicious wines while people were starving; we shake our heads, and wonder at the barbarism of our grandfathers, — the serf-owners, — who provided themselves with orchestras and theaters, and employed whole villages to keep up their gardens. From the height of our greatness we wonder at their inhumanity. We read the words of Isaiah v. 8, Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no room, and ye be made to dwell alone in the midst of the land.

11. Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink; that tarry late into the night, till wine inflame them!

12. And the harp, and the lute, the tabret, the pipe, and wine, are in their feasts: but they regard not the work of the Lord, neither have they considered the operation of his hands.

18. Woe unto them that draw iniquity with cords of vanity, and sin as it were with a cart rope.

20. Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!

21. Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight!

22. Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink:

23. Which justify the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him!

We read these words, and it seems to us that they have nothing to do with us. We read in the Gospel, Matthew iii. 10: And even now is the ax laid unto the root of the tree: every tree therefore that bringeth

not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

And we are quite sure that the good tree bearing good fruit is we ourselves, and that those words are said, not to us, but to some other bad men.

We read the words of Isaiah vi. 10: Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn again, and be healed.

11. Then said I, Lord, how long? And he answered, Until cities be waste without inhabitant, and houses without man, and the land become utterly waste.

We read and are quite assured that this wonderful thing has not happened to us, but to some other people. But it is for this very reason we do not see that this has happened to and is taking place with us. We do not hear, we do not see, and do not understand with our heart. But why has it so happened?

CHAPTER XXVI

How can a man who considers himself to be, we will not say a Christian, or an educated and humane man, but simply a man not entirely devoid of reason and of conscience,—how can he, I say, live in such a way that, not taking part in the struggle of all mankind for life, he only swallows up the labor of others, struggling for existence, and by his own claims increases the labor of those who struggle, and the number of those who perish in struggle?

And such men abound in our so-called Christian and cultured world; and not only do they abound in our world, but the very ideal of the men of our Christian, cultured world is to get the largest amount of property,—that is, wealth,—which secures all comforts and idleness of life by freeing its possessors from the struggle for existence, and enabling them, as much as

possible, to profit by the labor of those brothers of theirs who perish in that struggle.

How could men have fallen into such astounding error?

How could they have come to such a state that they can neither see nor hear nor understand with their heart that which is so clear, obvious, and certain?

One need only think for a moment in order to be terrified at the contradiction of our lives to what we profess to believe, we, whether we be Christian or only humane, educated people. Be it God or a law of nature that governs the world and men, good or bad, the position of men in this world, so long as we know it, has always been such that naked men, without wool on their bodies, without holes in which to take refuge, without food which they might find in the field like Robinson Crusoe on his island, are put into a position of a continual and incessant struggle with nature in order to cover their bodies by making clothes for themselves, to protect themselves by a roof over their heads, and to earn food in order twice or thrice a day to satisfy their hunger and that of their children and their parents.

Wherever and whenever and to whatever extent we observe the lives of men, whether in Europe, America, China, or Russia; whether we take into consideration all mankind, or a small portion, whether in olden times in a nomad state, or in modern times with steam-engines, steam-plows, sewing-machines, and electric light, — we shall see one and the same thing going on, — that men, working constantly and incessantly, are not able to get clothes, shelter, and food for themselves, their little ones, and the old, and that the greatest number of men as well in olden times as now perish from want of the necessities of life and from overwork.

Wherever we may live, if we draw a circle around us, of a hundred thousand, or a thousand, or ten, or even one mile's circumference, and look at the lives of those men who are inside our circle, we shall find half-starved children, old people male and female, pregnant women, sick and weak persons, working beyond their strength,

and who have neither food nor rest enough to support them, and who, for this reason, die before their time : we shall see others full-grown, who are even killed by dangerous and hurtful tasks.

Since the world has existed, we find that men with great efforts, sufferings, and privations have been struggling for their common wants, and have not been able to overcome the difficulty.

Besides, we also know that every one of us, wherever and however he may live, *nolens volens*, is every day, and every hour of the day, absorbing for himself a part of the labor done by mankind.

Wherever and however he lives, his house, the roof over him, do not grow of themselves ; the firewood in his stove does not get there of itself ; the water did not come of itself either ; and the baked bread does not fall down from the sky ; his dinner, his clothes, and the covering for his feet, all this has been made for him, not only by men of past generations, long dead, but it is being done for him now by those men of whom hundreds and thousands are fainting away and dying, in vain efforts to get for themselves and for their children sufficient shelter, food, and clothes, — means to save themselves and their children from suffering and a premature death.

All men are struggling with want. They are struggling so intensely that always around them their brethren, fathers, mothers, children, are perishing. Men in this world are like those on a dismantled or water-logged ship, with a short allowance of food ; all are put by God, or by nature, in such a position that they must husband their food, and unceasingly war with want.

Each interruption in this work of every one of us, each absorption of the labor of others useless for the common welfare, is ruinous, alike for us and them.

How is it that the majority of educated people, without laboring, are quietly absorbing the labors of others, necessary for their own lives, and are considering such an existence quite natural and reasonable ?

If we are to free ourselves from the labor proper and

natural to all, and lay it on others, at the same time not considering ourselves to be traitors and thieves, we can do so only by two suppositions,—first, that we (the men who take no part in common labor) are different beings from working men, and have a peculiar destiny to fulfil in society (like drone bees, which have a different function from the working bees); or secondly, that the business which we (men freed from the struggle for existence) are doing for other men is so useful for all that it undoubtedly compensates for that harm which we do to others in overburdening them.

In olden times, men who utilized the labor of others asserted, first, that they belonged to a different race; and secondly, that they had from God a peculiar mission,—caring for the welfare of others; in other words, to govern and teach them: and therefore they assured others, and partly believed themselves, that the business they did was more useful and more important for the people than those labors by which they profit. This justification was sufficient so long as the direct interference of God in human affairs, and the inequality of human races, was undoubted.

But with Christianity, and the consciousness of the equality and unity of all men proceeding from it, this justification could no longer be expressed in its previous form.

It was no longer possible to assert that men are born of different kind and quality, and having a different destiny; and the old justification, though still held by some, has been little by little destroyed, and has now almost entirely disappeared.

But though the justification disappeared, the fact itself, of the freeing of some men from labor, and the appropriation by them of other men's labor, remained the same for those who had the power of enforcing it. For this existing fact, new excuses have constantly been invented, in order that, without asserting the difference of human beings, men might be able to free themselves from personal labor with apparent justice. A great many such justifications have been invented.

However strange it may seem, the main object of all that has been called science, and the ruling tendency of science, has been the seeking out of such excuse.

This has been the object of the theological sciences and of the science of law; this was the object of so-called philosophy, and this became lately the object of modern rationalistic science. All the theological subtleties which aimed at proving that a certain church is the only true successor of Christ, and that, therefore, she alone has full and uncontrolled power over the souls and bodies of men, had in view this very object.

All the legal sciences — those of state law, penal law, civil law, and international law — have this sole aim; the majority of philosophical theories, especially that of Hegel, which reigned over the minds of men for such a long time, and maintained the assertion that everything which exists is reasonable, and that the state is a necessary form of the development of human personality, had only this one object in view.

Comte's positive philosophy and its outcome, the doctrine that mankind is an organism; Darwin's doctrine of the struggle for existence, directing life and its conclusion, the teaching of diversity of human races, the now so popular anthropology, biology, and sociology, — all have the same aim. These sciences have become favorites, because they all serve for the justification of the existing fact of some men being able to free themselves from the human duty of labor, and to consume other men's labor.

All these theories, as is always the case, are worked out in the mysterious sanctums of augurs, and in vague, unintelligible expressions are spread abroad among the masses, and adopted by them.

As in olden times, the subtleties of theology, which justified violence in church and state, were the special property of priests; and in the masses of the people, the conclusions, taken by faith, and ready made for them, were circulated, that the power of kings, clergy, and nobility was sacred; so afterward, the philosophical and legal subtleties of so-called science became the

property of the priests of science; and through the masses only the ready-made conclusions, accepted by faith, that social order (the organization of society) must be such as it is, and cannot be otherwise, was diffused.

So it is also now: it is only in the sanctuaries of the modern sages that the laws of life and development of organisms are analyzed. Whereas in the crowd, the ready-made conclusion accepted on trust, that division of labor is a law, confirmed by science, is circulated, and that thus it must be that some are starving and toiling, and others eternally feasting, and that this very ruin of some and feasting of others is the undoubted law of man's life, to which we must submit.

The current justification of their idleness of all so-called educated people, with their various activities, from the railway proprietor down to the author and artist, is this: We men who have freed ourselves from the common human duty of taking part in the struggle for existence, are furthering progress, and so we are of great use to all human society, of such use that it counter-balances all the harm we do the people by consuming their labor.

This reasoning seems to the men of our day to be not at all like the reasoning by which the former non-workers justified themselves; just as the reasoning of the Roman emperors and citizens, that but for them the civilized world would go to ruin, seemed to them to be of quite another order to that of the Egyptians and Persians, and so also an exactly similar kind of reasoning seemed in turn to the knights and clergy of the Middle Ages totally different from that of the Romans.

But it only seems to be so. One need but reflect upon the justification of our time in order to ascertain that in it there is nothing new. It is only a little differently dressed up, but it is the same because it is based upon the same principle. Every justification of one man's consumption of the labor of others, while producing none himself, as with Pharaoh and his soothsayers, the emperors of Rome and those of the Middle Ages and

their citizens, knights, priests, and clergy, always consists in these two assertions: First, we take the labor of the masses, because we are a peculiar people, called by God to govern them, and to teach them divine truths; secondly, those who compose the masses cannot be judges of the measure of labor which we take from them for the good we do them, because, as it has been said by the Pharisees, "This multitude which knoweth not the law are accursed." (John vii. 49.)

The people do not understand wherein lies their good, and therefore they cannot be judges of the benefits done to them. The justification of our time, notwithstanding all apparent originality, in fact consists of the same fundamental assertions: First, we are a peculiar people, — we are an educated people, — we further progress and civilization, and by this fact, we procure for the masses a great advantage. Secondly, the uneducated crowd does not understand that advantage which we procure for them, and therefore cannot be judges of it.

The fundamental assertions are the same. We free ourselves from labor, appropriate the labor of others, and by this increase the burden of our fellows, and assert that in compensation for this we bring them a greater advantage, of which they, owing to their ignorance, cannot be judges.

Is it not, then, the same thing? The only difference lies in this, that formerly the citizens, the Roman priests, the knights, and the nobility had claims on other men's labor, and now these claims are put forward by a caste who term themselves educated.

The lie is the same, because the men who justify themselves are in the same false position. The lie consists in the fact that, before beginning to reason about the advantages conferred on the people by men who have freed themselves from labor, certain men, Pharaohs, priests, or we ourselves, — educated people, — assume this position, and only afterward excogitate a justification for it.

This very position of some men who oppressed others, in former times as now, serves as a universal basis. The

difference of our justification from the ancient ones consists only in the fact that it is more false, and less well grounded. The old emperors and popes, if they themselves and the people believed in their divine calling, could plainly explain why they were the men to control the labor of others: they said that they were appointed by God Himself for this very thing, and from God they had a commandment to teach the people divine truths revealed to them, and to govern them.

But modern, educated men, who do not labor with their hands, acknowledging the equality of all men, cannot explain why they in particular and their children (for education is only by money; that is, by power) are those lucky persons who are called to an immaterial, easy utility, out of those millions who by hundreds and thousands are perishing in making it possible for them to be educated. Their only justification consists in this, that they, such as they now are, instead of doing harm to the people by freeing themselves from labor, and by swallowing up labor, bring to the people an advantage unintelligible to them, which compensates for all the evil perpetrated upon them.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE theory by which men who have freed themselves from personal labor justify themselves, in its simplest and most exact form, is this: We men, having freed ourselves from work, and having by violence appropriated the labor of others, find ourselves better able to benefit them; in other words, certain men, for doing the people a palpable and comprehensible harm, — utilizing by violence their labor, and thereby increasing the difficulty of their struggles with nature, — do to them an impalpable and incomprehensible good.

This proposition is a very strange one; but men, as well of former as also of modern times, who have lived on the labors of working-men, believe it, and calm their conscience by it. Let us see in what way it is justified

in different classes of men, who have freed themselves from labor in our own days.

I serve men by my activity in state or church, — as king, minister, archbishop; I serve men by my trading or by industry; I serve men by my activity in the departments of science or art.

By our activities we are all as necessary to the people as they are to us.

So say various men of to-day, who have freed themselves from laboring.

Let us consider *seriatim* those principles upon which they base the usefulness of their activity.

There are only two indications of the usefulness of any activity of one man for another: an exterior indication, — the acknowledgment of the utility of activity by those to whom it is produced; and an interior indication, — the desire to be of use to others lying at the root of the activity of the one who is trying to be of use.

Statesmen (I include the Church dignitaries appointed by the government in the category of statesmen) are of use to those whom they govern. The emperor, the king, the president of a republic, the prime minister, the minister of justice, the minister of war, the minister of public instruction, the bishop, and all under them, who serve the state, all live, having freed themselves from the struggle of mankind for existence, and having laid all the burden of this struggle upon other men, upon the ground that their non-activity compensates for this.

Let us apply the first indication to those for whose welfare the activity of statesmen is bestowed. Do they, I ask, recognize the usefulness of this activity?

Yes, it is recognized: most men consider statesmanship necessary to them; the majority recognize the usefulness of this activity in principle; but in all its manifestations as known to us, in all particular cases as known to us, the usefulness of each of the institutions and of each of the manifestations of this activity is not only denied by those for whose advantage it is performed, but they assert that this activity is even pernicious and hurtful. There is no state function or social activity which is

not considered by many men to be hurtful; there is no institution which is not considered pernicious, — courts of justice, banks, local self-government, police, clergy. Every state activity, from the minister down to the policeman, from the bishop to the sexton, is considered by some men to be useful, and by others to be pernicious. And this is the case, not only in Russia, but throughout the world, in France as well as in America.

All the activity of the republican party is considered pernicious by the radical party, and *vice versa*: all the activity of the radical party, if the power is in their hands, is considered bad by the republican and other parties. But not only is it a fact that the activity of statesmen is never considered by all men to be useful: their activity has, besides, this peculiarity, that it must always be carried on by violence, and that, in order to attain this end, there are necessary, murders, executions, prisons, taxes raised by force, and so on.

It therefore appears that, besides the fact that the usefulness of state activity is not recognized by all men, and is always denied by one portion of men, this usefulness has the peculiarity of vindicating itself always by violence.

And therefore the usefulness of state activity cannot be confirmed by the fact that it is recognized by those men for whom it is performed.

Let us apply the second test: let us ask statesmen themselves, from the tsar down to the policeman, from the president to the secretary, from the patriarch to the sexton, begging for a sincere answer, whether in occupying their respective positions, they have in view the good which they wish to do for men, or something else. In their desire to fill the situation of a tsar, a president, a minister, a police-sergeant, a sexton, a teacher, are they moved by the desire of being useful to men, or for their own personal advantage? And the answer of sincere men would be that the chief motive is their own personal advantage.

And so it appears that one class of men, who utilize the labor of others who perish by their labors, compensate

for such an undoubted evil by an activity which is always considered by a great many men to be not only useless, but pernicious; which cannot be voluntarily accepted by men, but to which they must always be compelled, and the aim of which is not the benefit of others, but the personal advantage of those men who perform it.

What is it, then, that confirms the theory that state activity is useful for men? Only the fact that those men who perform it, firmly believe it to be useful, and that it has been always in existence; but so have always been not only useless institutions, but very pernicious ones, like slavery, prostitution, and wars.

Business people (merchants, manufacturers, railway proprietors, bankers, landowners) believe in the fact that they do a good which undoubtedly compensates for the harm done by them. Upon what grounds do they believe it? To the question by whom the usefulness of their activity is recognized, men in church and in state are able to point to the thousands and millions of working-people who in principle recognize the usefulness of state and church activity; but to whom will bankers, distillers, manufacturers of velvet, of bronzes, of looking-glasses, to say nothing of guns, — to whom will they point when we ask them is their usefulness recognized by the majority?

If there can be found men who recognize the usefulness of manufacturing chintzes, rails, beer, and such like things, there will be found also a still greater number of men who consider the manufacture of these articles pernicious.

And as for the activity of merchants who raise the prices of all articles, and that of landowners, nobody would even attempt to justify it.

Besides, this activity is always associated with the harm done to working-people and with violence, if less direct than that of the state, yet just as cruel in its consequences; for the activities displayed in industry and in trade are entirely based upon taking advantage of the wants of working-people in every form, in order to compel working-men to hard and hated labor; to buy all

goods cheap, and to sell to the people the articles necessary for them at the highest possible price, and to raise the interest on money. From whatever point we consider their activity, we see that the usefulness of business-men is not recognized by those for whom it is expended, neither in principle nor in particular cases; and by the majority their activity is considered to be directly pernicious. If we were to apply the second test, and to ask, What is the chief motive of the activity of business-men? we should receive a still more determinate answer than that on the activity of statesmen.

If a statesman says that besides a personal advantage he has in view the common benefit, we cannot help believing him, and each of us knows such men; but a business-man, from the very nature of his occupations, cannot have in view a common advantage, and would be ridiculous in the sight of his fellows if he were in his business aiming at something besides the increasing of his own wealth and the keeping of it. And, therefore, working-people do not consider the activity of business-men of any help to them. Their activity is associated with violence toward such people; and its object is not their good, but always and only personal advantage; and lo! strange to say, these business-men are so assured of their own usefulness that they boldly, for the sake of this imaginary good, do an undoubted obvious harm to working-men by extricating themselves from laboring, and consuming the labor of the working-classes. Men of science and of art have freed themselves from laboring by putting this labor on others, and live with a quiet conscience, thinking they bring a sufficient advantage to other men to compensate for it.

On what is their assurance based? Let us ask them as we have done statesmen and business-men.

Is the utility of the arts and sciences recognized by all, or even by the majority of working-people?

We shall receive a very deplorable answer. The activity of men in church and state is recognized to be useful in theory by almost all, and in application by the majority of those for whom it is performed; the activity

of business-men is recognized as useful by a small number of working-people ; but the activity of men of science and of art is not recognized to be useful by any of the working-class. The usefulness of their activity is recognized only by those who are engaged in it, or who desire to practise it. Those who bear upon their shoulders all the labor of life, and who feed and clothe the men of science and art, cannot recognize the usefulness of the activity of these men, because they cannot even form any idea about an activity which always appears to working-men useless and even depraving.

Thus, without any exception, working-people think the same of universities, libraries, conservatories, picture and statue galleries, and theaters, which are built at their expense.

A working-man considers this activity to be so decidedly pernicious that he does not send his children to be taught ; and in order to compel people to accept this activity, it has been everywhere found necessary to introduce a law compelling parents to send the children to school.

A working-man always looks at this activity with ill-will, and only ceases to look at it so when he ceases to be a working-man, and having saved money, and been educated, he passes out of the class of working-people into the class of men who live upon the necks of others.

And notwithstanding the fact that the usefulness of the activity of men of science and art is not recognized, and even cannot be recognized, by any workman, these men are all the same compelled to make a sacrifice for such an activity.

A statesman simply sends another to the guillotine or to prison ; a business-man, utilizing the labor of another, takes away from him his last resource, leaving him the alternative of starvation, or labor destructive of his health and life ; but a man of science or of art seemingly compels nobody to do anything : he merely offers the good he has done to those who are willing to take it ; but, in order to be able to make his productions undesirable to the working-people, he takes away from the

people, by violence, through the statesmen, the greatest part of their labor for the building and keeping open of academies, universities, colleges, schools, museums, libraries, conservatories, and for the wages for himself and his fellows.

But if we were to ask men of science and art about the object which they are pursuing in their activity, we should receive the most astonishing replies.

A statesman would answer that his aim was the common welfare; and in his answer, there would be an admixture of truth confirmed by public opinion.

In the answer of the business-man, that his aim was social welfare, there would be less probability; but we could admit even this also.

But the answer of men of science and art strikes one at once by its want of proof and by its effrontery. Such men say, without bringing any proofs, just as priests used to do in olden times, that their activity is the most important of all, and the most necessary for all men, and that without it all mankind would go to ruin. They assert that it is so, notwithstanding the fact that nobody except they themselves either understands or acknowledges their activity, and notwithstanding the fact that, according to their own definition, true science and true art should not have a utilitarian aim.

These men are occupied with the matter they like, without troubling themselves what advantage will come out of it to men; and they are always assured that they are doing the most important thing, and the most necessary for all mankind.

So that while a sincere statesman, acknowledging that the chief motive of his activity is a personal one, tries to be as useful as possible to the working-people; while a business-man, acknowledging the egotism of his activity, tries to give it an appearance of being one of universal utility, — men of science and art do not consider it necessary to seem to shelter themselves under a pretense of usefulness: they deny even the object of usefulness, so sure are they, not only of the usefulness, but even of the sacredness, of their own business.

And now it turns out that the third class of men, who have freed themselves from labor, and have laid it on other men, are occupied with things which are totally incomprehensible to working-people, and which these people consider to be trifles, and often very pernicious trifles; and are occupied with these things without any consideration of their usefulness, but merely for the gratification of their own pleasure: it turns out that these men are, from some reason or other, quite assured that their activity will always produce that without which working-people would never be able to exist.

Men have freed themselves from laboring for their living, and have thrown the work upon others, who perish under it; they utilize this labor, and assert that their occupations, which are incomprehensible to all other men, and which are not directed to useful aims, compensate for all the evil they are doing to men by freeing themselves from the labor of earning their livelihood, and swallowing up the labor of others.

The statesman, in order to compensate for that undoubted and obvious evil which he does to man by freeing himself from the struggle with nature, and by appropriating the labor of others, does men another obvious and undoubted harm by countenancing all sorts of violence.

The business-man, in order to compensate for that undoubted and obvious harm which he does to men by using up their labor, tries to earn for himself as much wealth as possible; that is, as much of other men's labor as possible.

The man of science and art, in compensating for the same undoubted and obvious harm which he does to working-people, is occupied with matters to which he feels attracted, and which is quite incomprehensible to working-people, and which, according to his own assertion, in order to be a true one, ought not to aim at usefulness.

And therefore, all these men are quite sure that their right of utilizing other men's labor is secure. Yet it seems obvious that all those men who have freed them-

selves from the labor of earning their livelihood have no ground for doing this.

But, strange to say, these men firmly believe in their own righteousness, and live as they do with an easy conscience. There must be some plausible ground, some false belief, at the bottom of such a profound error.

CHAPTER XXVIII

AND in reality the position in which men, living by other men's labor, are placed, is based, not only upon a certain belief, but upon an entire doctrine; and not only on one doctrine, but on three, which have grown one upon another during centuries, and are now fused together into an awful deceit, or humbug as the English call it, which hides from men their unrighteousness.

The oldest of these in our world, which justifies the treason of men against the fundamental duty of labor to earn their livelihood, was the Church-Christian doctrine, according to which men, by the will of God, differ one from another, as the sun differs from the moon and the stars, and as one star differs from another. Some men God ordains to have dominion over all; others to have power over many; others, still, over a few; and the remainder are ordained by God to obey.

This doctrine, though already shaken to its foundations, still continues to influence some men, so that many who do not accept it, who often even ignore the existence of it, are, nevertheless, guided by it.

The second is what I cannot help terming the State-philosophical doctrine. According to it, as fully developed by Hegel, all that exists is reasonable, and the established order of life is constant and sustained, not merely by men, but as the only possible form of the manifestation of the spirit, or generally, of the life of mankind.

This doctrine, too, is no longer accepted by men who direct social opinion, and it holds its position only by the property of inertia.

The last doctrine, which is now ruling the minds of men, and on which is based the justification as well of leading statesmen as also of leading men of business and of science and art, is a scientific one, not in the evident sense of the word, meaning knowledge generally, but in the sense of a knowledge peculiar in form as well as in matter, termed science in particular. On this new doctrine particularly is based in our days the justification of man's idleness, hiding from him his treason against his calling.

This new doctrine appeared in Europe contemporaneously with a large class of rich and idle people, who served neither the church nor the state, and who were in want of a justification of their position.

Not very long ago in France, before the revolution in Europe, it was always the case that all non-working-people, in order to have a right to utilize other men's labor, were obliged to have some definite occupation,—to serve in the church, the state, or the army.

Men who served the government, governed the people; those who served the church, taught the people divine truths; and those who served the army, protected the people.

Only these three classes of men—the clergy, the statesmen, and the military men—claimed for themselves the right of utilizing working-men's labor, and they could always point out their services to the people: the remaining rich men, who had not this justification, were despised, and, feeling their own want of right, were ashamed of their wealth and of their idleness. But as time went on, this class of rich people who did not belong either to the clergy, to the government, or to the army, owing to the vices of these three classes, increased in number, and became a powerful party. They were in want of a justification of their position. And one was invented for them. A century had not elapsed when the men who did not serve either the state or the church, and who took no part whatever in their affairs, received the same right to live by other men's labor as the former classes; and they not only left off

being ashamed of their wealth and idleness, but began to consider their position quite justified. And the number of such men has increased and is still increasing in our days.

And the most wonderful of all is this, that these men, the same whose claims to be freed from laboring were unrecognized not long ago, now consider themselves alone to be fully right, and are attacking the former three classes, — the servants of the church, state, and army, — alleging their exemption from labor to be unjust, and often even considering their activity to be directly pernicious. And what is still more wonderful is this, that the former servants of church, state, and army do not now lean upon the divineness of their calling, nor even upon the philosophy which considers the state necessary for individual development, but they set aside these supports which have so long maintained them, and are now seeking the same supports on which the new reigning class of men, who have found a novel justification, stands, and at the head of which are the men of science and art.

If a statesman now sometimes, appealing to old memories, justifies his position by the fact that he was set in it by God, or by the fact that the state is a form of the development of personality, he does it because he is behind the age, and he feels that nobody believes him.

In order to justify himself effectually, he ought to find now neither theological nor philosophical, but other new, scientific supports.

It is necessary to point to the principle of nationalities, or to that of the development of an organism; and to gain over the ruling class, as in the Middle Ages it was necessary to gain over the clergy, and as at the end of the last century it was necessary to obtain the sanction of philosophers, as seen in the case of Frederick the Great and Catherine of Russia. If now a rich man, after the old fashion, says sometimes that it is God's providence which makes him rich, or if he points to the importance of a nobility for the welfare of a state, he does it because he is behind the times.

In order to justify himself completely, he must point to his furthering progress and civilization by improving the modes of production, by lowering the prices of consumption, by establishing an intercourse between nations. A rich man ought to think and to speak in scientific language, and, as the clergy formerly, he has to offer sacrifices to the ruling class: he must publish magazines and books, provide himself with a picture gallery, a musical society, a kindergarten, or a technical school. The ruling class is the class of learned men and artists of a definite character. They possess complete justification for having freed themselves from laboring; and upon this justification (as in former times upon the theological justification and afterward upon the philosophical one) all is based; and it is these men who now give the diploma of exemption to other classes.

The class of men who now feel completely justified in freeing themselves from labor, is that of men of science and particularly of experimental, positive, critical, evolutionary science, and of artists who develop their ideas according to this tendency.

If a learned man or an artist, after the old fashion, speaks nowadays about prophecy, revelation, or the manifestation of the spirit, he does so because he is behind the age, but he will not succeed in justifying himself: in order to stand firm he must try to associate his activity with experimental, positive, critical science, and he must make this science the fundamental principle of his activity. Then only would the science or the art with which he is occupied appear to be a true one, and he would then stand in our days on firm ground, and then will there be no doubt as to the usefulness he is bringing to mankind. The justification of all those who have freed themselves from laboring is based upon experimental, critical, positive science.

The theological and philosophical explanations have already had their day: they timidly and bashfully now introduce themselves to notice, and try to humor their scientific usurper, which, however, boldly knocks down and destroys the remnants of the past, everywhere

taking its place, and with assurance in its own firmness lifts aloft its head.

The theological justification maintained that men by their destination are called, — some to govern, others to obey; some to live sumptuously, others to labor; and therefore those who believed in the revelation of God could not doubt the lawfulness of the position of those men who, according to the will of God, are called to govern and to be rich.

The state-philosophical justification used to say, The state with all its institutions and differences of classes, according to rights and possessions, is that historical form which is necessary for the right manifestation of the spirit in mankind; and therefore the situation which every one occupies in state and in society according to his rights and to his possessions must be such as to insure the sound life of mankind.

The scientific theory says, All this is nonsense and superstition: the one is the fruit of the theological period of thought, and the other of the metaphysical period.

For the study of the laws of the life of human societies, there is only one sure method, — that of a positive, experimental, critical science. It is only sociology based upon biology, based again upon all other positive sciences, which is able to give us new laws of the life of mankind. Mankind, or human societies, are organisms either already perfect, or in a state of development subject to all the laws of the evolution of organisms. One of the first of these laws is the division of labor among the portions of the organs. If some men govern, and others obey, some live in opulence, and others in want, then this takes place, neither according to the will of God, nor because the state is the form of the manifestation of personality, but because in societies as in organisms a division of labor takes place which is necessary for the life of the whole. Some men perform in societies the muscular part of labor, and others the mental.

Upon this doctrine is built the ruling excuse of the age.

CHAPTER XXIX

CHRIST teaches men in a new way, and this teaching is written down in the Gospels.

It is first persecuted, and then accepted; and upon it at once a complete system of theological dogma is invented, which is thereafter accepted for the teaching of Christ. The system is absurd, it has no foundation; but by virtue of it, men are led to believe that they may continue to live in an evil way, and none the less be Christians. And this conclusion is so agreeable to the mass of weak men, who have no affection for moral effort, that the system is eagerly accepted, not only as true, but even as the Divine truth as revealed by God Himself. And the invention becomes the groundwork on which for centuries theologians build their theories.

Then by degrees these learned men diverge by various channels into special systems of their own, and finally endeavor to overthrow each others' theories. They begin to feel there is something amiss, and cease to understand what they themselves are talking about. But the crowd still requires them to expound its favorite instruction; and thus the theologians, pretending both to understand and believe what they are saying, continue to dispense it.

In process of time, however, the conclusions drawn from theological conceptions cease to be necessary to the masses, who, then, peeping into the very sanctuaries of their augurs, discover them to be utterly void of those glorious and indubitable truths which the mysteries of theology had seemed to suggest.

The same happened to philosophy, not in the sense of the wisdom of men like Confucius or Epictetus, but with professional philosophy, when it humored the instincts of the crowd of rich and idle people. Not long ago, in the learned world, a moral philosophy was in fashion, according to which it appeared that everything that is, is reasonable; that there is neither good nor

evil; that man has not to struggle with evil, but has merely to manifest the spirit, some in military service, some in courts of justice, and some on the violin.

Many and various were the expressions of human wisdom, and as such were known to the men of the nineteenth century, — Rousseau, Pascal, Lessing, and Spinoza; and all the wisdom of antiquity was expounded, but none of its systems laid hold of the crowd. We cannot say that Hegel's success was due to the harmony of his theory. We had no less harmonious theories from Descartes, Leibnitz, Fichte, and Schopenhauer.

There was only one reason for the fact that this doctrine became for a short time the belief of the civilized world, the same which had caused the success of theology; to wit, that the deductions of this philosophical theory humored the weak side of men's nature. It said, All is reasonable, all is good; nobody is to blame for anything.

And as at first with the church upon theological foundations, so also, with the philosophy of Hegel for a base, a Babel's tower was built (some who are behind the age are still sitting upon it); and here again was a confusion of tongues, men feeling that they themselves did not know of what they were talking, but trying to conceal their ignorance, and to keep their prestige before the crowd.

When I began life, Hegelianism was the order of the day; it was in the very air you breathed; it found its expression in newspapers and magazines, in lectures upon history and upon law, in novels, in tracts, in art, in sermons, in conversation. A man who did not know Hegel, had no right to open his mouth; those who desired to learn the truth, were studying Hegel, — everything pointed to him; and lo! forty years have elapsed, and nothing is left of him; there is no remembrance of him; all is as though he had never existed. And the most remarkable of all is that, as false Christianity, so also Hegelianism has fallen, not because some one had refuted or overthrown it, — no, it is now as it was before,

— but both have only become no longer necessary for the learned, educated world.

If, at the present time, any man of culture is questioned about the system of theological dogma, he will neither contradict nor argue, but will simply ask, "Why should I believe these dogmas?" — "What good are they to me?"

So also with Hegelianism. No one of our day will argue its theses. He will only inquire, "What Spirit?" "Where did it come from?" "With what purpose?" "What good will it do me?" Not very long ago the sages of Hegelianism were solemnly teaching the crowd; and the crowd, understanding nothing, blindly believed all, finding the confirmation of what suited them, and thinking that what seemed to them to be not quite clear, or even contradictory, on the heights of philosophy was clearer than day; but time went on, the theory was worn out, a new one appeared in its place, the former one was no longer demanded, and again the crowd looked into the mysterious temples of the augurs, and saw there was nothing there, and that nothing had ever been there but words, very dark and meaningless.

(This happened within my memory.) These things happened, we are told, because they were ravings of the theological and metaphysical period; but now we have a critical, positive science, which will not deceive us, because it is based upon induction and experience. Now our knowledge is no longer uncertain as it formerly was, and it is only by following it that one can find the answer to all the questions of life.

But this is exactly the same that was said by the old teachers, and they certainly were no fools, and we know that among them were men of immense intellect; and within my memory the disciples of Hegel said exactly the same thing, with no less assurance and no less acknowledgment on the side of the crowd of so-called educated people. And such men as our Herzen, Stankevich, Byelinsky, were no fools either. But why, then, has this wonderful thing happened, that clever men preached with the greatest assurance, and the

crowd accepted with veneration such groundless and meaningless doctrines? The reason of it is only that these doctrines justified men in their bad mode of living.

A very commonplace English writer, whose books are now almost forgotten and recognized as the emptiest of all empty ones, wrote a tract upon population, in which he invented an imaginary law that the means of living does not increase with increase of population. This sham law the author dressed out with formulæ of mathematics, which have no foundation whatever, and published it. Judged by the lightness of mind and the want of talent displayed in this treatise, we might suppose that it would have passed unnoticed, and been forgotten as all other writings of the same author have been; but it turned out quite differently. The author who wrote it became at once a scientific authority, and has maintained this high position for nearly half a century. Malthus! The Malthusian theory,—the law of the increase of population in geometrical progression, and the increase of means of living in arithmetical progression, and the natural and prudent means of restraining the increase of population,—all these became scientific, undoubted truths which have never been verified, but being accepted as axioms, have served for further deductions.

Thus learned, educated men were deceived; whereas in the crowd of idle men, there was a devout trust in the great laws discovered by Malthus. How, then, did this happen? These seem to be scientific deductions, which had nothing in common with the instincts of the crowd.

But this is so only to those who believe science to be something self-existent, like the Church, not liable to errors, and not merely the thoughts of weak men liable to mistakes, who only for importance' sake call by a pompous word, *science*, their own thoughts and words. It was only necessary to draw practical conclusions from the Malthusian theory in order to see that it was quite a human one with very determinate aims.

The deductions which followed directly from this

theory were the following: The miserable condition of working-people does not come from the cruelty, egotism, and unreasonableness of rich and strong men, but it exists according to an unchangeable law which does not depend upon man, and, if anybody is to blame, it is the starving working-people themselves: why do these fools come into the world when they know that they will not have enough to eat? and therefore the wealthy and powerful classes are not at all to blame for anything, and they may quietly continue to live as they have done.

This conclusion, precious to the crowd of idle men, induced all learned men to overlook the incorrectness and total arbitrariness of the deductions; and the crowd of educated idle people, instinctively guessing to what these deductions led, greeted the theory with delight, set upon it the seal of truth, and cherished it during half a century. The reason for all this was that these doctrines justified men in their bad mode of life.

Is not the same cause at the bottom of the self-assurance of men of positive, critical, experimental science, and of the reverent regard of the crowd to what they preach? At first it appears strange that the theory of evolution justifies men in their unrighteousness, and that the scientific theory has only to do with facts, and does nothing else than observe facts. But it only seems so.

So it had been with theological teaching: theology seemed to be occupied only with doctrines, and to have nothing to do with the lives of men; so it had been with philosophy, which also seemed to be occupied only with facts.

So it had been with the teaching of Hegel on a large scale, and with the theory of Malthus on a small one. Hegelianism seemed to be occupied merely with its logical constructions, and to have nothing to do with the lives of men; so with the theory of Malthus, which seemed to be occupied exclusively with statistics.

But it only seemed so.

Modern science is also occupied exclusively with facts: it studies facts.

But what facts? Why such facts, and not others?

The men of modern science are very fond of speaking with a solemn assurance, "We study facts alone," imagining that these words have some meaning.

To study facts alone is quite impossible, because the number of facts which may be objects of our study is countless, in the strict sense of the word.

Before beginning to study facts, one must have some theory, according to which facts are studied; that is, these or those being selected from the countless number of facts. And this theory indeed exists, and is even very definitely expressed, though many of the agents of modern science ignore it; that is, do not want to know it, or really do not know it, and sometimes pretend not to know it.

Thus matters stood before with all most important beliefs.

The foundations of each are always given in theory; and so-called learned men seek only for further deductions from various foundations given to them, though sometimes ignoring even these.

But a fundamental theory must always be present. So is it also now: modern science selects its facts upon the ground of a determinate theory, which sometimes it knows, sometimes does not wish to know, sometimes really does not know; but it exists. And the theory is this: All mankind is an undying organism; men are particles of the organs of this organism, having each his special calling for the service of the whole. As the cells, growing into an organism, divide among themselves the labor of the struggle for existence of the whole organism, increase one capacity, and diminish another, and all together form an organ in order better to satisfy the wants of the whole organism; and as among social animals,—ants and bees,—the individuals divide the labor among themselves (queen bees lay eggs, drone bees fecundate, working-bees labor for the life of the whole),—so also in mankind and in human societies there takes place the same differentiation and integration of the parts. And, therefore, in order to find the law of man's life, we must study the laws of the lives and develop-

ment of organisms. And in these we find the following laws: That each phenomenon is followed by more than one consequence; the failure of uniformity; the law of uniformity and diversity; and so on. All this seems to be very innocent, but we need only draw deductions from these observations of facts in order to see at once to what they are tending.

These facts lead to one thing, — the acknowledgment that the existence in human societies of division of activities is organic; that is, necessary. And they therefore induce us to consider the unjust position in which we are, who have freed ourselves from laboring, not from the point of reasonableness and justice, but merely as an indubitable fact which confirms a general law. Moral philosophy used also to justify every cruelty and wickedness; but there it turned out to be philosophical, and therefore incorrect: but according to science, the same thing turns out to be scientific, and therefore unquestionable.

How, then, can we help accepting such a fine theory! We need only look at human society merely as at an object of observation, and we may quietly devour the labor of perishing men, calming ourselves with the idea that our activity as a dancing-master, a lawyer, a doctor, a philosopher, an actor, an investigator of the theory of mediumism and of forms of atoms, and so on, is a functional activity of the organism of mankind, and therefore there cannot be a question whether it is just that I should live doing only what is pleasant, as there can be no question whether the division of labor between a mental and a muscular cell is just or not. How, then, can we help accepting such a nice theory which enables us afterward forever to put our conscience into our pockets, and live a completely unbridled, animal life, feeling under our feet a firm, scientific support? And it is upon this new belief that the justification of idleness and the cruelty of men is built.

CHAPTER XXX

THIS doctrine had its commencement about half a century ago. Its chief founder was the French philosopher Comte. Comte, being a lover of systematic theory, and at the same time a man of religious tendency, was impressed by the then new physiological researches of Bichat; and he conceived the old idea, expressed in by-gone days by Menenius Agrippa, that human societies, indeed all human-kind, may be regarded as one whole, an organism; and men, — as live particles of separate organs, each having his definite destination to fulfil in the service of the whole organism.

Comte was so fascinated by this idea, that he founded upon it his philosophical theory; and this theory so captivated him, that he quite forgot that the point of departure he had started from was no more than a pretty comparison, suitable enough in a fable, but in no way justifiable as the foundation of a science. As often happens, he took his pet hypothesis for an axiom, and so imagined that his whole theory was based upon the most firm and positive foundations.

According to his theory, it appeared that, as mankind is an organism, therefore the knowledge of what man is and what ought to be his relation to the world is only possible through a knowledge of the properties of this organism. In order to learn these properties, man is fitted to make observations upon the lower organisms, and draw deductions from their lives.

Therefore, first, the true and exclusive method of science, according to Comte, is the inductive one, and science is only science when it has experiment for its basis; secondly, the final aim and the summit of science becomes the new science concerning the imaginary organism of mankind, or the organic being, — mankind; this new hypothetic science is sociology; from this view of science, it generally turns out that all former knowledge was false, and that the whole history of mankind, in the sense of its self-consciousness, divides itself into three,

or rather into two, periods: first, the theological and metaphysical period, from the beginning of the world to Comte; and secondly, the modern period of true science, positive science, beginning with Comte.

All this was very well, but there was a single mistake in it; it was this: that all this edifice was built upon the sand, upon an arbitrary and incorrect assertion that mankind, collectively considered, was an organism. This assertion was arbitrary, because there is no more reason why, if we acknowledge the existence of mankind to be an organism, we should refuse to allow the correctness of all the various theological propositions.

It was incorrect, because to the idea of mankind, that is, of men, the definition of an organism was incorrectly added, whereas mankind lacks the essential characteristic of an organism, — a center of sensation or consciousness. We call an elephant, as well as a bacterium, organisms, only because we suppose by analogy in these beings unification of sensations or consciousness. As for human societies and mankind, they lack this essential; and, therefore, however many other general character signs we may find out in mankind and in an organism, without this the acknowledgment of mankind to be an organism is incorrect.

But notwithstanding the arbitrariness and incorrectness of the fundamental proposition of positive philosophy, it was accepted by the so-called educated world with great sympathy, because of that great fact important for the crowd, that it afforded a justification of the existing order of things by recognizing the lawfulness of the existing division of labor; that is of violence in mankind. It is remarkable in this respect that from the writings of Comte, composed of two parts, — a positive philosophy and a positive politics, — by the learned world, only the first part was accepted, that which justified upon new experimental principles the existing evil in human society; the second part, treating of the moral altruistic duties following from this recognition of mankind to be an organism, was considered not only to be unimportant, but even unscientific.

Here the same thing was repeated which occurred with the two parts of Kant's writings: the "Critique of Pure Reason" was accepted by science; but the "Critique of Practical Reason," that part which contains the essence of moral doctrine, was rejected. In the teaching of Comte, that was recognized to be scientific which humored the reigning evil.

But the positive philosophy, accepted by the crowd, based upon an arbitrary and incorrect supposition, was by itself too ill-grounded, and therefore too unsteady, and could not be sustained by itself.

And now among all the idle play of ideas of so-called men of science, there also appeared a similarly arbitrary and incorrect assertion, not a new one at all, to the effect that all living beings, that is, organisms, proceed one from another; not only one organism from another, but one organism from many; that during a very long period, a million of years for instance, not only a fish and a duck may have proceeded from one and the same forefather, but also one organism might have proceeded from many separate organisms; so, for instance, out of a swarm of bees a single animal may proceed. And this arbitrary and incorrect assertion was accepted by the learned world with still greater sympathy.

This assertion was an arbitrary one, because nobody has ever seen how one kind of organism is made from others; and therefore the hypothesis about the origin of species will always remain a mere supposition, and never will become an experimental fact.

This hypothesis was incorrect because the solution of the problem of the origin of species by the theory that they had their origin in the law of inheritance and accommodation during an infinitely long time, was not at all a solution of the problem, but the mere iteration of the question in another form.

According to the solution of this problem by Moses (in opposition to which consists all the object of Comte's theory), it appeared that the variety of the species of living beings proceeded from the will of God and His infinite omnipotence: according to the theory of evolution,

it appears that the variety of species of living beings proceeded by themselves in consequence of the infinite variety of conditions of inheritance and environment in an infinite period of time.

The theory of evolution, speaking plainly, asserts only that by chance in an infinite period of time anything you like may proceed from anything else you choose.

This is no answer to the question; it is simply the same question put differently: instead of will is put chance, and the coefficient of the infinite is transferred from omnipotence to time.

But this new assertion, enforced by Darwin's followers in an arbitrary and inaccurate spirit, maintained the former assertion of Comte, and therefore it became a revelation for our time, and the foundation of all sciences, even that of the history of philosophy and religion; and besides, according to the *naïve* confession of the very founder of Darwin's theory, this idea was awakened in him by the law of Malthus; and therefore he pointed to the struggle for existence of not only men, but of all living beings, as to a fundamental law of every living thing. And this was exactly what was wanted by the crowd of idle people for their own justification.

Two unstable theories which could not stand upon their own feet supported each other, and received a show of stability. Both the theories bore in them a sense, precious for the crowd, that for the existing evil in human societies men are not to be blamed, that the existing order is what ought to be, and thus the new theory was accepted by the crowd in the sense which was wanted by them, with full confidence and unprecedented enthusiasm.

And so the new scientific doctrine was founded upon two arbitrary and incorrect propositions, which were accepted in the same way as dogmas of faith are accepted. Both in matter and form, this new doctrine is remarkably similar to the Church-Christian one. In matter, the similarity lies in the fact that, in both doctrines alike, a fantastical meaning is attached to really

existing things, and this artificial meaning is taken as the object of our research.

In the Church-Christian doctrine, the Christ which did really exist is screened away by a whole system of fantastical theological dogmas; in the positive doctrine, to the really existing fact of live men is attributed the fantastical attributes of an organism.

In form, the similarity of these two doctrines is remarkable, since, in both cases, a theory emanating from one class of men is accepted as the only and infallible truth. In the Church-Christian doctrine, the Church's way of understanding God's revelation to men is regarded as the sacred and only true one. In the doctrine of positivism, certain men's way of understanding science is regarded as absolutely correct and true.

As the Church-Christians regard the foundation of their church as the only origin of the true knowledge of God, and only out of a kind of courtesy admit that former believers may also be regarded as having formed a church; so in precisely the same manner does positive science, according to its own statement, place its origin in Comte: and its representatives, also only out of courtesy, admit the existence of previous science, and that only as regarding certain thinkers, as, for instance, Aristotle. Both the Church and positive science altogether exclude the ideas of all the rest of mankind, and regard all knowledge outside their own as erroneous.

In our time, the old dogma of evolution comes in with new importance to help the fundamental dogma of Comte concerning the organism of mankind; and from these two elements a new scientific doctrine has been formed. If it is not quite clear to a believer in the organism of mankind why a collection of individuals may be counted as an organism, the dogma of evolution is charged with the explanation. This dogma is needed to reconcile the contradictions and certainties of the first: mankind is an organism, and we see that it does not contain the chief characteristic of an organism; how must we account for it?

Here the dogma of evolution comes in, and explains, Mankind is an organism in a state of development. If you accept this, you may then consider mankind as such.

A man who is free from the positive superstition cannot even understand wherein lies the interest of the theory of the origin of species and of evolution; and this interest is explained, only when we learn the fundamental dogma, that mankind is an organism. And as all the subtleties of theology are intelligible only to those who believe in its fundamental dogmas, so also all the subtleties of sociology, which now occupy the minds of all men of this recent and profound science, are intelligible only to believers.

The similarity between these two doctrines holds good yet further. Being founded upon dogmas accepted by faith, these doctrines neither question nor analyze their own principles, which, on the other hand, are used as starting-points for the most extraordinary theories. The preachers of these call themselves, in theology, sanctified; in positive knowledge, scientific; in both cases, infallible. And at the same time, they attain the most peremptory, incredible, and unfounded assertions, which they give forth with the greatest pomp and seriousness, and which are with equal pomp and seriousness contradicted in all their details by others who do not agree, and yet who equally recognize the fundamental dogmas.

The Basil the Great of scientific doctrine, Spencer, in one of his first writings expresses these doctrines thus: Societies and organisms, says he, are alike in the following points: First, in that, being conceived as small aggregates, they imperceptibly grow up in mass, so that some of them become ten thousand times bigger than their originals.

Secondly, in that, while in the beginning they have such simple structure that they may almost be considered as structureless, in their growth they develop an ever increasing complexity of structure.

Thirdly, in that, though in their early undeveloped

period there does not exist among them any dependence of particles one upon another, these particles by and by acquire a mutual dependence, which at last becomes so strong that the activity and the life of each part is possible only with the activity and the lives of all others.

Fourthly, in this, that the life and the development of society is more independent and longer than the life and the development of every unit which goes to form it, and which are separately born and growing and acting and multiplying and dying while the political body formed of them continues to live one generation after another, developing in mass, in perfection of structure, and in functional activity.

Then follow the points of difference between organisms and societies, and it is demonstrated that these differences are only seeming ones, and that organisms and societies are quite similar. For an impartial man the question at once arises, What are you, then, speaking about? Why is mankind an organism, or something similar?

You say that societies are similar to organisms according to these four points; but even this comparison is incorrect. You take only a few characteristics of an organism, and you then apply them to human societies. You produce four points of similarity, then you take the points of difference which you say are only seemingly so, and you conclude that human societies may be considered as organisms.

But this is nothing else than an idle play of dialectics. Upon this ground we may consider as organism everything we choose. I take the first thing which comes to my mind, — a forest, — as it is planted in a field and grows up: first beginning as a small aggregate, it imperceptibly increases in mass. This is also the case with fields, when, after being planted, they are gradually covered with forest trees. Secondly, in the beginning the structure of an organism is simple, then the complexity increases, and so on.

The same is the case with the forest: at first there are only birch trees, then hazel, and so on; first all

the trees grow straight, and afterward they interlace their branches. Thirdly, the dependence of the parts increases so that the life of each part depends upon the lives and activities of all the others: it is exactly the same with the forest; the nut tree warms the trunks (if you hew it down, the other trees will be frozen in winter), the underwood keeps off wind, the seed trees continue the species, the tall and leafy ones give shadow, and the life of each tree depends upon that of the rest. Fourthly, separate parts may die, but the whole organism continues to live. Separate trees perish, but the forest continues in life and growth. The same holds good with the example so often brought by the defenders of the scientific doctrine. Cut off an arm,—the arm will die: we may say remove a tree from the shadow and the ground of a forest, it will die.

Another remarkable similarity between this scientific doctrine and the Church-Christian one—as also in the case of any other theory founded upon propositions accepted through faith—lies in their capacity of being proof against logic.

After having demonstrated that by this theory a forest may be considered as an organism, you think you have proved to the followers of the theory of organisms the incorrectness of their definition? Not at all. Their definition of an organism is so inexact and dilatable, that they can apply it to everything they like.

Yes, they will say, you may consider the forest, too, as an organism. A forest is a mutual coöperation of the individuals who do not destroy each other; an aggregate: its parts can also pass into a closer relationship, and by differentiation and integration it may become an organism.

Then you will say that, in that case, the birds too and the insects, and the herbs of this forest, which mutually coöperate and do not destroy each other, may be considered with the trees to be an organism. They would agree to this too. According to their theory, we may consider as an organism every collection of living beings which mutually coöperate, and do not destroy one

another. You may establish a connection and coöperation between everything you like, and, according to evolution, you may assert that from anything may proceed anything else you like, if a long enough period is granted.

It is quite impossible to prove to a believer in a theological doctrine, that his doctrine is false. But one may tell him that if one man arbitrarily asserts one dogma, another has the same right arbitrarily to invent and assert another. One may say the same thing with yet better ground to the followers of positive and evolutionary science. Upon the basis of this science one could undertake to prove anything one liked. And the strangest thing of all is that this same positive science regards the scientific method as a condition of true knowledge, and that it has itself defined the elements of the scientific method. It professes that common-sense is the scientific method. And yet common-sense itself discloses at every step the fallacies of this doctrine. The moment those who occupied the position of saints felt that there was no longer anything sacred left in them, like the Pope and our own Synod, they immediately called themselves not merely sacred, but "most sacred." The moment science felt that it had given up common-sense, it called itself the science of reason, the only really scientific science.

CHAPTER XXXI

THE division of labor is the law pervading every existing thing, therefore it must exist in human societies too.

That may be so; but the question still remains, whether the now existing division of labor in human society is that division which ought to be. And when men consider a certain division of labor to be reasonable and just, no science whatever can prove to men that there ought to be that which they consider to be unreasonable and unjust.

The theological theory demonstrated that power is of

God, and it very well may be so. But the question still remains, To whom is the power given, — to Catherine the Empress, or to the rebel Pugatchof? And no theological subtleties whatever can solve this difficulty. Moral Philosophy demonstrated that a state is merely a form of the social development of the individual; but the question still remains, Can the state of a Nero or that of a Gengis Khan be considered a form of such development? And no transcendental words whatever can solve the difficulty.

It is the same with scientific science also. The division of labor is the condition of the life of organisms and of human societies; but what have we to consider in these human societies to be an organic division of labor? And however much science studies the division of labor in the molecules of a tapeworm, all these observations cannot compel men to acknowledge a division of labor to be correct which cannot be admitted by their reason and conscience. However convincing may be the proofs of the division of labor in the cells of investigated organisms, a man, if he has not yet lost his reason, will say it is wrong that some should only weave cloth all their life long, and that this is not a division of labor, but oppression of a human being.

Herbert Spencer and others say that, as there are a whole population of weavers, therefore the weaver's activity is the organic division of labor. Saying this, they use a similar line of reasoning as do theologians. There is a power, and therefore it is of God, whatever it may be: there are weavers, therefore they exist as a result of the law of division of labor. There might be some sense in this if the power and the position of weavers were created by themselves; but we know that they are not, but that it is we who create them. Well, then, we ought to ascertain whether we have established this before-mentioned power according to the will of God, or of ourselves, and whether we have called these weavers into being by virtue of some organic law, or from some other cause.

Here are men earning their living by agriculture, as

it is proper for all men to do: one man has arranged a smith's forge, and mended his plow; his neighbor comes to him, and asks him to mend his plow, too, and promises to give labor or money in return. A second comes with a similar request; others follow; and in the society of these men, a form of division of labor arises: thus, one man becomes a smith.

Another man has taught his children well; his neighbor brings him his children, and asks him to teach them, and thus a teacher is formed; but the smith as well as the teacher become, and continue to be, such, only because they were asked, and they remain such as long as people require their trades. If it happens that too many smiths and teachers appear, or if their labor is no longer wanted, they at once, according to common-sense, throw aside their trade, and become laborers again, as it everywhere always happens where there is no cause for the violation of a right division of labor.

Men who behave in such a way are directed both by their reason and their conscience; and therefore we who are endowed with reason and conscience, all agree that such a division of labor is a right one. But if it were to happen that smiths, having the possibility of compelling other men to labor for them, were to continue to make horseshoes when there was no longer a demand for them, and teachers were to wish to continue to teach when there was nobody to be taught, so to every impartial man endowed with reason and conscience it would become obvious that such is not real division of labor, but a usurpation of other men's labor; because such a division could no longer be tested satisfactorily by that sole standard by which we may know whether it is right or not, — the demand of such labor by other men, and a voluntary compensation offered for it by them. And exactly such an overplus, however, is that which scientific science terms a division of labor.

Men do that which others do not require, and they ask to be fed for this, and say it is just, because it is division of labor. That which forms the chief social evil of a people, not only with us alone, is the

countless number of government functionaries: that which is the cause of the economical misery of our days is what is called in England over-production (that is, the production of an enormous quantity of articles, wanted by nobody, and which no one knows how to get rid of). All this comes simply from this strange idea about the division of labor.

It would be very strange to see a bootmaker who considered that men were bound to feed him because, forsooth, he continued to produce boots wanted by no one; but what shall we say about those men in government, church, science, and art, who not only do not produce anything tangibly useful for the people, and whose produce is wanted by nobody, and who as boldly require to be well fed and clothed on account of the division of labor?

There may be some sorcerers, for whose activity there is a demand, and to whom men give cakes and spirits; but we cannot even imagine the existence of such sorcerers who, while their sorcery is not wanted by anybody, require to be fed simply because they wish to practise their art. And this very thing is the case in our world with men in church and state, with men of science and art. And all this proceeds from that false conception of the division of labor which is defined, not by reason and conscience, but by deductions to which men of science so unanimously resort.

The division of labor, indeed, has always existed; but it is correct only when man decides wherein it ought to consist by his reason and conscience, and not by his making observation upon it. And the conscience and the reason of all men solve this question in the simplest and surest way. They always decide that question by recognizing the division of labor to be a right one only when the special activity of a man is so necessary to others, that they, asking him to serve them, freely offer to feed him in compensation for what he will do for them. But when a man from his infancy up to his thirtieth year lives upon the shoulders of other men, promising to do, when he finishes his studies, something

very useful which nobody has ever asked him for, and then for the rest of his life lives in the same way, promising only to do presently something which nobody asks him to do, this would not be a true division of labor, but, as it really is, only a violation by a strong man of the labor of others, — the same appropriation of others' labor by a strong man which formerly theologians called divine destination; philosophers, inevitable conditions of life; and now scientific science, the organic division of labor.

All the importance of the ruling science consists in this alone. This science becomes now the dispenser of diplomas for idleness, because she alone in her temples analyzes and determines what activity is a parasitic and what an organic one in the social organism. As if men could not, each for himself, much better decide it, and more quickly, too, by consulting his reason and conscience.

And as formerly, both for the clergy and then for statesmen, there could not have been any doubt as to who were most necessary for other people, so now for the men of positive science it seems that there cannot be any doubt about this, that their own activity is undoubtedly an organic one: they, factors of science and art, are the cells of the brain, the most precious cells of all the human organism. Let us leave them to reign, eat and drink, and be feasted, as priests and sophists of old have done before them, as long as they do not deprave men!

Since men exist as reasonable creatures, they have discriminated good from evil, making use of what has been done in this direction before them by others, struggled with evil, seeking a true and better way, and slowly but unceasingly have been advancing in this way. And always across it various deceits stood before them, which had in view to show them that this struggle was not at all necessary for them, but that they should submit to the tide of life. There existed the awful old deceits of the Church; with dreadful struggle and effort men little by little got rid of them: but scarcely had they done so when in the place of the old deceit arose a new one, — a state and philosophical one. Men freed themselves out of these too.

And now a new deceit, a still worse one, springs up in their path, — the scientific one.

This new deceit is exactly such as the old ones were : its essence consists in the substitution for reason and conscience of something external ; and this external thing is observation, as in theology it was revelation.

The snare of this science consists in this, that having shown to men the most barefaced perversions of the activity of reason and conscience, it destroys in them confidence in both reason and conscience. Things which are the property of conscience and reason are now to be discerned by observation alone : these men lose the conception of good and evil, and become unable to understand those expressions and definitions of good and evil which have been worked out by all the former existence of mankind.

All that reason and conscience say to themselves, all that they said to the highest representatives of men since the world has existed, all this in their slang is conditional and subjective. All this must be left behind.

It is said by reason, one cannot apprehend the truth, because reason is liable to error : there is another way, unmistakable and almost mechanical, — one ought to study facts upon the ground of science, that is, upon two groundless suppositions, positivism and evolution, which are given out to be most undoubted truths. And the ruling science, with mock solemnity, asserts that the solving of all the questions of life is only possible through studying the facts of nature, and especially those of organisms.

The credulous crowd of youth, overwhelmed by the novelty of this authority, not only not destroyed, but not yet even touched by critics, rush to the study of these facts of natural sciences to that only way which, according to the assertion of the ruling doctrine, alone can lead to the elucidation of all questions of life. But the farther the students proceed in this study, the farther do they remove, not only the possibility of solving the questions of life, but even the very thought of this solution ; the more they grow accustomed, not so

much to observe themselves, as to believe upon their word other men's observations (to believe in cells, in protoplasm, in the fourth dimension of matter, and so on); the more the form hides from them the contents; the more they lose the consciousness of good and evil, and the capacity of understanding those expressions and definitions of good and evil which have been worked out by all the former career of mankind; the more they appropriate to themselves that special scientific slang of conditional expressions which have no common human meaning in them; the farther and farther they get into the thick forest of observations which is not lighted up by anything; the more they lose the capacity, not only of an independent thinking, but even of understanding other men's fresh human ideas which are not included in their Talmud: but chiefly they pass their best years in losing the habit of life, that is, of laboring, and accustom themselves to consider their own position justified, and thus become physically good-for-nothing parasites, and mentally dislocate their brains, and lose all power of thought-productiveness.

And so by degrees, their capacities more and more blunted, they acquire self-assurance, which deprives them forever of the possibility of returning to a simple, laborious life, to any plain, clear, common, human manner of thinking.

CHAPTER XXXII

THE division of labor in human society has always existed, and I dare say always will exist; but the question for us is, not whether or not it has been and will still continue, but what should guide us to arrange that this division may be a right one.

If we take the facts of observation for our standard, we must refuse to have any standard at all: every division of labor which we see among men, and which may seem to us to be a right one, we shall consider right; and this is what the ruling scientific science is leading us to.

Division of labor !

Some are occupied with mental and spiritual, others with muscular and physical, labor.

With what an assurance do men express this ! They wish to think so, and that seems to them in reality a correct exchange of services which is only the very apparent ancient violence.

Thou, or rather you (because it is always many who have to feed one), — you feed me, dress me, do for me all this rough labor, which I require of you, to which you are accustomed from your infancy, and I do for you that mental work to which I have already become accustomed. Give me bodily food, and I will give you in return the spiritual.

The statement seems to be a correct one ; and it would really be so if only such exchange of services were free, if those who supply the bodily food were not obliged to supply it before they get the spiritual. The producer of the spiritual food says, In order that I may be able to give you this food, you must feed me, clothe me, and remove all filth from my house.

But as for the producer of bodily food, he must do it without making any claims of his own, and he has to give bodily food whether he receive spiritual food or not. If the exchange were a free one, the conditions on both sides would be equal. We agree that spiritual food is as necessary to man as bodily. The learned man, the artist, says, Before we can begin to serve men by giving them spiritual food, we want men to provide us with bodily food.

But why should not the producers of this latter say, Before we begin to serve you with bodily food, we want spiritual food ; and until we receive it, we cannot labor ?

You say, I require the labor of a plowman, a smith, a bootmaker, a carpenter, masons, and others, in order that I may prepare the spiritual food I have to offer.

Every workman might say, too, Before I go to work, to prepare bodily food for you, I want the fruits of the spirit. In order to have strength for laboring, I require

a religious teaching, the social order of common life, application of knowledge to labor, and the joys and comforts which art gives. I have no time to work out for myself a teaching concerning the meaning of life, — give it to me.

I have no time to think out statutes of common life which would prevent the violation of justice, — give me this too. I have no time to study mechanics, natural philosophy, chemistry, technology; give me books with information as to how I am to improve my tools, my ways of working, my dwelling, the heating and lighting of it. I have no time to occupy myself with poetry, with plastic art, or music; give me those excitements and comforts necessary for life; give me these productions of the arts.

You say it is impossible for you to do your important and necessary business if you were to be deprived of the labor working-people do for you; and I say, a workman may declare, It is impossible for me to do my important and necessary business, not less important than yours, — to plow, to cart away refuse, and clean *your* houses, — if I be deprived of a religious guidance corresponding to the wants of my intellect and my conscience, of a reasonable government which would secure my labor, of information for easing my labor, and the enjoyment of art to ennoble it. All you have offered me in the shape of spiritual food is not only of no use to me whatever, but I cannot even understand to whom it could be of any use. And until I receive this nourishment, proper for me as for every man, I cannot produce bodily food to feed you with.

What if the working-people should speak thus? And if they said so, it would be no jest, but the simplest justice. If a working-man said this, he would be far more in the right than a man of intellectual labor; because the labor produced by the working-man is more urgent and more necessary than that done by the producer of intellectual work, and because a man of intellect is hindered by nothing from giving that spiritual food which he promised to give, but the working-man is hindered in

giving the bodily food by the fact that he himself is short of it.

What, then, should we, men of intellectual labor, answer, if such simple and lawful claims were made upon us? How should we satisfy these claims? Should we satisfy the religious wants of the people by the catechism of Philaret, by sacred histories of Sokolof, by the literature sent out by various monasteries and St. Isaak's cathedral? And should we satisfy their demand for order by the Code of Laws, and cassation verdicts of different departments, or by statutes of committees and commissions? And should we satisfy their want of knowledge by giving them spectrum analysis, a survey of the Milky Way, speculative geometry, microscopic investigations, controversies concerning spiritualism and mediumism, the activity of academies of science? How should we satisfy their artistic wants? By Pushkin, Dostoyevsky, Turgenieff, L. Tolstoï, by pictures of French *salons*, and of those of our artists who represent naked women, satin, velvet, and landscapes, and pictures of domestic life, by the music of Wagner, and that of our own musicians?

All this is of no use, and cannot be of any use, because we, with our right to utilize the labor of the people, and absence of all duties in our preparation of their spiritual food, have quite lost from sight the single destination our activity should have.

We do not even know what is required by the working-man; we have even forgotten his mode of life, his views of things, his language; we have even lost sight of the very working-people themselves, and we study them like some ethnographical rarity or newly discovered continent. Now, we, demanding for ourselves bodily food, have taken upon ourselves to provide the spiritual; but in consequence of the imaginary division of labor, according to which we may not only first take our dinner, and afterward do our work, but may during many generations dine luxuriously, and do no work, — in the way of compensation for our food we have prepared something which is of use, as it seems to us, for

ourselves and for science and art, but of no use whatever for those very people whose labor we consume under the pretext of providing them in return with intellectual food, and not only of no use, but quite unintelligible and distasteful to them.

In our blindness we have to such a degree left out of sight the duty which we took upon us, that we have even forgotten for what our labor is being done; and the very people whom we undertook to serve, we have made an object of our scientific and artistic activities. We study them and represent them for our own pleasure and amusement: we have quite forgotten that it is our duty, not to study and depict, but to serve them.

We have to such a degree left out of sight the duty which we assumed, that we have not even noticed that other people do what we undertook in the departments of science and art, and that our place turns out to be occupied.

It appears that, while we have been in controversy, now about the immaculate conception, and now about spontaneous generation of organisms; now about spiritualism, and now about the forms of atoms; now about pangenesis, now about protoplasms, and so on, — the rest of the world none the less required intellectual food, and the abortive outcasts of science and art began to provide for the people this spiritual food by order of various speculators who had in view exclusively their own profit and gain.

Now, for some forty years in Europe, and ten years in Russia, millions of books and pictures and songs have been circulating; shows have been opened; and the people look and sing, and receive intellectual food, though not from those who promised to provide it for them; and we, who justify our idleness by the need for that intellectual food which we pretend to provide for the people, are sitting still, and taking no notice.

But we cannot do so, because our final justification has vanished from under our feet. We have taken upon ourselves a peculiar department: we have a peculiar functional activity of our own. We are the brain of the people. They feed us, and we have undertaken to

teach them. Only for the sake of this have we freed ourselves from labor. What, then, have we been teaching them? They have waited years, tens of years, hundreds of years. And we are still conversing among ourselves, and teaching each other, and amusing ourselves, and have quite forgotten them; we have so totally forgotten them, that others have taken upon themselves to teach and amuse them, and we have not even become aware of this in our flippant talk about division of labor: and it is very obvious that all our talk about the utility we offer to the people was only a shameful excuse.

CHAPTER XXXIII

THERE was a time when the Church guided the intellectual life of the men of our world. The Church promised men happiness, and, in compensation for this, she freed herself from taking part in mankind's common struggle for life.

And, as soon as she did so, she went astray from her calling, and men turned away from her. It was not the errors of the Church which caused her ruin, but the fact that her ministers had violated the law of labor with the help of the secular power in the time of Constantine, and their claim to idleness and luxury gave birth to her errors.

As soon as she obtained this right, she began to care for herself, and not for man, whom she had taken upon herself to serve. The ministers of the Church gave themselves up to idleness and depravity.

The state took upon itself to guide men's lives. The state promised men justice, peace, security, order, satisfaction for common intellectual and material wants, and in compensation men who served the state freed themselves from taking part in the struggle for life. And the state's servants, as soon as they were enabled to utilize other men's labor, have acted in the same way as the ministers of the Church.

They had not in view the people; but the state servants, from kings down to the lowest functionaries, in Rome, as well as in France, England, Russia, and America, gave themselves over to idleness and depravity.

And men lost their faith in the state, and now anarchy is seriously advocated as an ideal.

The state lost its prestige among men, only because its ministers claimed the right of utilizing for themselves the people's labor.

Science and art have done the same with the assistance of the state power which they took upon themselves to sustain. They have also claimed and obtained for themselves the right of idleness, and of utilizing other men's labor, and have also been false to their calling. And their errors also proceeded only from the fact that their ministers, pointing to a falsely conceived principle of the division of labor, claimed for themselves the right to utilize the work of the people, and so lost the meaning of their calling, making the aim of their activity, not the utility of the people, but a mysterious activity of science and art; and also, like their forerunners, they have given themselves over to idleness and depravity, though not so much to a fleshly, as to an intellectual, corruption.

It is said science and art have done much for mankind. This is quite true.

Science and art also have done much for mankind, not because, but in spite of, the fact that men of science and art, under the pretext of division of labor, live upon the shoulders of the working-people.

The Roman Republic was powerful, not because its citizens were able to lead a life of depravity, but because it could number amongst them men who were virtuous.

The same is the case with science and art.

Science and art have effected much for mankind, not because their ministers had sometimes formerly, and have always at present, the possibility of freeing themselves from laboring, but because men of genius, not utilizing these rights, have forwarded the progress of mankind.

The class of learned men and artists who claim, on account of a false division of labor, the right of utilizing other men's labor, cannot contribute to the progress of true science and true art, because a lie can never produce a truth.

We are so accustomed to our pampered or debilitated representatives of intellectual labor, that it would seem very strange if a learned man or an artist were to plow or cart manure. We think that, were he to do so, all would go to ruin; that all his wisdom would be shaken out of him, and the great artistic images he carries in his breast would be soiled by the manure: but we are so accustomed to our present conditions that we do not wonder at our ministers of science, that is, ministers and teachers of truth, compelling other people to do for them that which they could very well do themselves, passing half their time eating, smoking, chattering in "liberal" gossip, reading newspapers, novels, visiting theaters; we are not surprised to see our philosopher in an inn, in a theater, at a ball; we do not wonder when we learn that those artists who delight and ennoble our souls, pass their lives in drunkenness, in playing cards, in company with loose women, or do things still worse.

Science and art are fine things: but, just because they are fine things, men ought not to spoil them by associating them with depravity; by freeing themselves from man's duty to serve by labor, his own life and the lives of other men.

Science and art have forwarded the progress of mankind. Yes; but this was not done by the fact that men of science and art, under the pretext of a division of labor, taught men by word, and chiefly by deed, to utilize by violence the misery and sufferings of the people, in order to free themselves from the very first and unquestionable human duty of laboring with their hands in the common struggle of mankind with nature.

CHAPTER XXXIV

"BUT it is," you say, "this very division of labor, the freeing men of science and of art from the necessity of earning their bread, that has rendered possible that extraordinary success in science which we see in our days.

"If everybody were to plow, these enormous results would not be attained; there would not be those astonishing successes which have so enlarged man's power over nature; there would not be those discoveries in astronomy which so strike the minds of men and promote navigation; there would be no steamers, railways, wonderful bridges, tunnels, steam-engines, and telegraphs, photographs, telephones, sewing-machines, phonographs, electricity, telescopes, spectroscopes, microscopes, chloroform, Lister bandages, carbolic acid."

I will not attempt to enumerate all the things of which our century is so proud. This enumeration, and the ecstasy of contemplation of ourselves and of our great deeds, you may find in almost every newspaper and popular book.

These raptures of self-contemplation are so often repeated, and we are so seldom tired of praising ourselves, that we really come to believe, with Jules Verne, that science and art have never made such progress as in our time. And all this is rendered possible only by division of labor: how can we, then, avoid countenancing it?

Let us suppose that the progress of our century is indeed striking, astonishing, extraordinary; let us suppose that we, too, are particularly lucky in living at such an extraordinary time: but let us try to ascertain the value of these successes, not by our own self-contentment, but by the very principle of the division of labor; that is, by that intellectual labor of men of science for the advantage of the people which has to compensate for the freeing men of science and art from labor.

All this progress is very striking indeed; but owing to some unlucky chance, recognized, too, by men of sci-

ence, this progress has not as yet ameliorated, but it has rather deteriorated, the condition of working-men.

Though a working-man, instead of walking, can use the railway, it is this very railway which has caused his forest to be burned, and has carried away his bread from under his very nose, and put him into a condition which is next door to slavery to the railway proprietor.

If, thanks to the engines and steam-machines, a working-man can buy cheap, and poor calico, it will be these very engines and machines which have deprived him of his wages, and brought him to a state of entire slavery to the manufacturer.

If there are telegraphs, which he is not forbidden to use, but which he does not use because he cannot afford it, then each of his productions, the value of which fluctuates, is bought up from under his very eyes by capitalists at low prices, thanks to the telegraph, before the working-man even becomes aware that the article is in demand.

Though there are telephones and telescopes, novels, operas, picture-galleries, and so on, the life of the working-man is not at all improved by any of them, because all, owing to the same unlucky chance, are beyond his reach. So that, after all, these wonderful discoveries and productions of art, if they have not made the life of working-people worse, have by no means improved it: on this the men of science are agreed.

So that, if to the question as to the reality of the successes attained by the sciences and arts, we apply, not our rapture of self-contemplation, but the very standard on which the ground of the division of labor is defended, — utility to the working world, — we shall see that we have not yet any sound reason for the self-contentment to which we consign ourselves so willingly.

A peasant uses the railway; a peasant's wife buys calico; in the cottage a lamp, and not a pine-knot, burns; and the peasant lights his pipe with a match, — this is comfortable; but what right have I from this to say that railways and factories have done good to the people?

If a peasant uses the railway, and buys a lamp, calico, and matches, he does it only because we cannot forbid his doing so: we all know very well that railways and factories have never been built for the use of the people; why, then, should the casual comfort a working-man obtains by chance be brought forward as a proof of the usefulness of these institutions to the people?

We all know very well that if those engineers and capitalists who build a railway or a factory have been thinking about working-people, they have been thinking only how to make the best possible use of them. And we see they have fully succeeded in doing so as well in Russia as in Europe and America.

In every hurtful thing there is something useful. After a house has been burned down, we may sit and warm ourselves, and light our pipes with one of the firebrands; but should we therefore say that a conflagration is beneficial?

Whatever we do, let us not deceive ourselves. We all know very well the motives for building railways, and for producing kerosene and matches. An engineer builds a railway for the government, to facilitate wars, or for the capitalists for financial purposes. He makes machines for manufacturers for his own advantage, and for the profit of capitalists. All that he makes or ex-cogitates he does for the purpose of the government, the capitalists, and other rich people. His most skilful inventions are either directly harmful to the people, as guns, torpedoes, solitary prisons, and so on; or they are not only useless, but quite inaccessible to them, as electric light, telephones, and the innumerable improvements of comfort; or, lastly, they deprave the people, and rob them of their last kopek, that is, their last labor, for spirits, wine, beer, opium, tobacco, calicoes, and all sorts of trifles.

But if it happens sometimes that the inventions of men of science, and the works of engineers, are of any use to the people, as, for instance, railways, calicoes, steel, scythes, it only proves that, in this world of ours, all things are mutually connected together, and that, out

of every hurtful activity, there may arise an accidental good for those to whom this activity was hurtful.

Men of science and of art can say that their activity is useful for the people, only if they have aimed in their activity at serving the people, as they do now to serve governments and capitalists.

We could have said that, only if men of science and art made the wants of the people their object; but such is not the case.

All learned men are occupied with their sacred business, which leads to the investigation of protoplasms, the spectrum analysis of stars, and so on: but concerning investigations as to how to set an ax, or with what kind it is more advantageous to hew; which saw is the most handy; with what flour bread shall be made, how it may best be kneaded, how to set it to rise; how to heat and to build stoves; what food, drink, crockery-ware, it is best to use; what mushrooms may be eaten, and how they may be prepared more conveniently,—science has never troubled itself.

And yet all this is the business of science.

I know that, according to its own definition, science must be useless; but this is only an excuse, and a very impudent one.

The business of science is to serve people. We have invented telegraphs, telephones, phonographs, but what improvements have we made in the life of the people? We have catalogued two millions of insects! but have we domesticated a single animal since biblical times, when all our animals had long been domesticated, and still the elk and the deer, and the partridge and the grouse and the wood-hen, are wild?

Botanists have discovered the cells, and in the cells protoplasms, and in protoplasms something else, and in this something else again.

These occupations will evidently never end, and therefore learned men have no time to do anything useful. And hence from the times of the ancient Egyptians and Hebrews, when wheat and lentils were already cultivated, down to the present time, not a single plant has

been added for the nourishment of the people except potatoes, and these have not been discovered by science. We have invented torpedoes, house-drains ; but the spinning-wheel, weaving-looms, plows and ax-handles, flails and rakes, buckets and well-sweeps, are still the same as in the time of Rurik.

And if some things have been improved, it is not the learned who have done it.

The same is the case with art. We have praised up many great writers, have carefully sifted these writers, and have written mountains of critiques and criticisms upon critics ; we have collected pictures in galleries, and we have thoroughly studied all the schools of art ; and we have such symphonies and operas that we ourselves are tired of listening to ; but what have we added to the folk-lore, legends, tales, songs ? what pictures, what music, have we created for the people ?

Books and pictures are published, and harmoniums are made, for the people, but we do not care for either.

That which is most striking and obvious is the false tendency of our science and art, which manifests itself in those departments which, according to their own propositions, would seem to be useful to people, and which, owing to this tendency, appear rather pernicious than useful. An engineer, a surgeon, a teacher, an artist, an author, seem by their very professions to be obliged to serve the people, but what do we see ?

With the present tendency, they can bring to the people nothing but harm. An engineer and a mechanic must work with capital : without capital they are good for nothing.

All their informations are such that, in order to make use of them, they need capital and the employment of working-people on a large scale, to say nothing of the fact that they themselves are accustomed to spend from fifteen hundred to two thousand rubles a year, and therefore they cannot go to a village, since no one there can give them any such remuneration : they, from their very occupations, are not fit for the service of the people.

They understand how to calculate by means of the highest mathematics the arch of a bridge, how to calculate power and the transfer of power in an engine, and so on : but they will be at a loss to meet the plain requirements of popular labor ; they do not know how to improve the plow or the cart ; how to make a brook passable, taking into consideration the conditions of a working-man's life.

They know and understand nothing of all this, less even than does the poorest peasant. Give them workshops, plenty of people, order engines from abroad, then they will arrange these matters. But to find out how to ease the labor of millions of people in their present condition, they do not know, and cannot do it ; and accordingly, by their knowledge and habits and wants, they are not at all fit for this business. A surgeon is in a still worse condition. His imaginary science is such that he understands how to cure those only who have nothing to do, and who may utilize other men's labor. He requires a countless number of expensive accessories, instruments, medicines, sanitary dwellings, food, and drains, in order that he may act scientifically : besides his fee, he demands such expenses that, in order to cure one patient, he must kill with starvation hundreds of those who bear this expense.

He has studied under eminent persons in the capital cities, who attend only to such patients whom they may take into hospitals, or who can afford to buy all the necessary medicines and machines, and even go at once from north to the south, to these or those mineral waters, as the case may be.

Their science is such that every country surgeon complains that there is no possibility of attending to the working-people, who are so poor that they cannot afford sanitary accommodations, and that there are no hospitals, and that he cannot attend to the business alone, that he requires help and assistant-surgeons. What does this really mean ?

It means this, — that the want of the necessities of life is the chief cause of people's misfortunes, and as

well the source of diseases as also of their spreading and incurability. And now science, under the banners of the division of labor, calls its champions to help the people. Science has settled satisfactorily about rich classes, and seeks how to cure those who can get everything necessary for the purpose, and it sends persons to cure in the same way those who have nothing to spare. But there are no means; and therefore they are to be raised from the people, who become ill, and catch diseases, and cannot be cured for want of means.

The advocates of the healing art for the people say that, up to the present time, this business has not been sufficiently developed.

Evidently it is not yet developed, because if, which God forbid! it were developed among our people, and, instead of two doctors and midwives and two assistant-surgeons in the district, there should be twenty sent, as they want, then there would soon be no one left to attend to. The scientific coöperation for the people must be quite a different one. And such coöperation, which ought to be, has not yet begun.

It will begin when a man of science, an engineer or a surgeon, will cease to consider as lawful that division of labor, or rather that taking away other men's labor, which now exists, and when he no longer considers that he has the right to take, I do not say hundreds of thousands, but even a moderate sum of one thousand or five hundred rubles as a compensation for his services; but when such a man comes to live among laboring people in the same condition and in the same way as they, then he will apply his information in mechanics, technics, hygiene, to the curing of working-people.

But now scientific men, who are fed at the expense of the working-man, have quite forgotten the conditions of the life of these men: they ignore (as they say) these conditions, and are quite seriously offended that their imaginary knowledge does not find application among the people.

The departments, as well of the healing art as the

mechanical, have not yet been touched: the questions how best to divide the time of labor, how and upon what it is best to feed, how best to dress, how to counteract dampness and cold, how best to wash, to suckle, and swaddle children, and so on, and all these applied to those conditions in which the working-people are, — all these questions have not yet been put.

The same applies to the activity of scientific teachers, — pedagogues. Science has arranged this business, too, in such a way that teaching according to science is possible only for those who are rich; and the teachers, like the engineers and surgeons, are involuntarily drawn toward money, and among us in Russia especially toward the government.

And this cannot be otherwise, because a school properly arranged (and the general rule is that the more scientifically a school is arranged, the more expensive it is), with convertible benches, globes, maps, libraries, and method-manuals for teachers and pupils, is just such a school for whose maintenance it is necessary to double the taxes of the people. So science wants to have it. The children are necessary for work, and the more so with the poorer people. The advocates of science say, Pedagogy is even now of use for the people; but let it be developed, and instead of twenty schools in a district, let there be a hundred, all of them scientifically arranged, and the people will support these schools. But then they will be still poorer, and will want the labor of their children still more urgently.

What is then to be done?

To this they reply, The government will establish schools, and will make education obligatory as it is in the rest of Europe. But the money will still have to be raised from the people, and labor will be still harder for them, and they will have less time to spare from their labor, and there will be then no obligatory education at all.

There is, again, only one escape, — for a teacher to live in the conditions of a working-man, and to teach for that compensation which will be freely offered him.

Such is the false tendency of science which deprives it of the possibility to fulfil its duty in serving the people. But this false tendency of our educated class is still more obvious in art-activity, which, for the sake of its very meaning, ought to be accessible to the people.

Science may point to its stupid excuse that science is acting for science, and that, when it will be fully developed, it will become accessible to the people; but art, if it is art indeed, ought to be accessible to all, especially to those for the sake of whom it is created. And our art strikingly denounces its factors in that they do not wish, and do not understand, and are not able to be of use to the people. A painter, in order to produce his great works, must have a large studio, in which at least forty joiners or bootmakers might work, who are now freezing or suffocating in wretched lodgings. But this is not all: he requires models, costumes, journeys from place to place. The Academy of Art has spent millions of rubles collected from the people for the encouragement of art; and the productions of this art are hung in palaces, and are neither intelligible to the people, nor wanted by them.

Musicians, in order to express their great ideas, must gather about two hundred men with white neckties or in costumes and spend hundreds of thousands of rubles to arrange operas. But this art-production would never appear to the people (even if they could afford to use it) as anything but perplexing or dull. The authors, writers, seem not to want any particular accommodations, studios, models, orchestras, and actors; but here also it turns out that an author, a writer, to say nothing of all the comforts of his dwelling and all the comforts of his life, in order to prepare his great works, wants traveling, palaces, cabinets, enjoyments of art, theaters, concerts, mineral waters, and so on. If he himself has not saved up enough money for this purpose, he is given a pension in order that he may compose better. And, again, these writings, which we value so highly, remain, for the people, rubbish, and are not at all necessary to them.

What if, according to the wish of men of science and

art, such producers of mental food should multiply, so that, in every village, it would be necessary to build a studio, provide an orchestra, and keep an author in the conditions which men of art consider indispensable to them? I dare say working-people would make a vow never to look at a picture, or listen to a symphony, or read poetry and novels, in order only not to be compelled to feed all these good-for-nothing parasites.

And why should not men of art serve the people? In every cottage there are holy images and pictures; each peasant, each woman of the people, sings; many have instruments of music; and all can relate stories, repeat poetry; and many of them read. How came it to pass that these two things were separated which were as much made for one another as a key for a lock, and how are they so separated that we cannot imagine how to reunite them?

Tell a painter to paint without a studio, models, costumes, and to draw penny pictures, he will say that this would be a denying of art as he understands it. Tell a musician to play on a harmonium, and to teach country-women to sing songs; tell a poet to throw aside writing poems and novels and satires, and to compose song-books for the people, and stories and tales which might be intelligible to ignorant persons,—they will say you are cracked.

But is it not being worse than cracked when men who have freed themselves from labor because they promised to provide mental food for those who have brought them up and are feeding and clothing them, afterward have so forgotten their promise that they have ceased to understand how to make food fit for the people? Yet this very forsaking of their promises they consider dignifies them. Such is the case everywhere, they say. Everywhere the case is very unreasonable, then; and it will be so while men, under the pretext of division of labor, promise to provide mental food for the people, but only swallow up the labor of the people. Men will serve the people with science and art, only when, living among and in the same way as do the

people, putting forth no claims whatever, they offer to the people their scientific and artistic services, leaving it to the free will of the people to accept or refuse them.

CHAPTER XXXV

To say that the activities of the arts and sciences have coöperated in forwarding the progress of mankind, and by these activities to mean that which is now called by this name, is the same as to say that an awkward moving of the oars, hindering the progress of a boat going down the stream, is forwarding the progress of the boat; but it only hinders it. The so-called division of labor—that is, the violation of other men's labor which has become in our time a condition of the activity of men of art and science—has been, and still remains, the chief cause of the slowness of the progress of mankind.

The proof of it we have in the acknowledgment of all men of science and art that the acquisitions of art and science are not accessible to the working-classes because of a wrong distribution of wealth. And the incorrectness of this distribution does not diminish in proportion to the progress of art and science, but rather increases. And it is not astonishing that such is the case; because the incorrect distribution of wealth proceeds solely from the theory of the division of labor, preached by men of art and science for selfish purposes.

Science, defending the division of labor as an unchangeable law, sees that the distribution of wealth based upon the division of labor is incorrect and pernicious, and asserts that its activity, which recognizes the division of labor, will set all right again, and lead men to happiness.

It appears, then, that some men utilize the labor of others; but if they will only continue to do this for a long time, and on a still larger scale, then this incorrect distribution of wealth, that is, utilizing of other men's labor, will vanish.

Men are standing by an ever increasing spring of water, and are busy turning it aside from thirsty men, and then they assert that it is they who produce this water, and that soon there will be so much of it that everybody will have enough and to spare. And this water, which has been running unceasingly, and nourishing all mankind, is not only not the result of the activity of those men who, standing at the source of it, turn it aside, but this water runs and spreads itself in spite of the endeavors of those men to stop it from doing so.

There has always existed a true church,—in other words, men united by the highest truth accessible to them at a certain epoch,—but it has never been that church which gave herself out for such; and there have always been real art and science, but it was not that which calls itself now by these names.

Men who consider themselves to be the representatives of art and science in a given period of time, always imagine that they have been doing, and will continue to do, wonderful things, and that beyond them there has never been any art or science. Thus it seemed to the sophists, to the scholiasts, alchemists, cabalists, Talmudists, and to our own scientific science and to our artistic art.

CHAPTER XXXVI

“BUT science! art! You repudiate science, art; that is, you repudiate that by which mankind live.”

I am always hearing this: people choose this way to put aside my arguments altogether without analyzing them. He repudiates science and art; he wishes to turn men back again to the savage state; why, then, should we listen to him, or argue with him?

But it is unjust. I not only do not repudiate science—human reasonable activity—and art,—the expression of this reasonable activity,—but it is only in the name of this reasonable activity, and its expression, that I say what I do, in order that mankind may avoid the savage

state toward which they are rapidly moving, owing to the false teaching of our time.

Science and art are as necessary to men as food, drink, and clothes, — even still more necessary than these ; but they become such, not because we decide that what we call science and art are necessary, but because they indeed are necessary to men. Now, if I should prepare hay for the bodily food of men, my idea that hay is the food for men would not make it to be so. I cannot say, Why do you not eat hay when it is your necessary food ? Food is, indeed, necessary, but perhaps what I offer is not food at all.

This very thing has happened with our science and art. And to us it seems that when we add to a Greek word the termination *logy*, and call this science, it will be science indeed ; and if we call an indecency, like the dancing of naked women, by the Greek word “chorography,” and term it art, it will be art indeed.

But however much we may say this, the business which we are about, in counting up the insects, and chemically analyzing the contents of the Milky Way, in painting water-nymphs and historical pictures, in writing novels, and in composing symphonies, this, our business, will not become science or art until it is willingly accepted by those for whom it is being done.

And till now it has not been accepted. If only some men were allowed to prepare food, and all others were either forbidden to do it, or be rendered incapable of producing it, I dare say that the quality of the food would deteriorate. If these men who have the exclusive privilege of producing food were Russian peasants, then there would be no other food than black bread, kvas, potatoes, and flour, which they are fond of, and which is agreeable to them. The same would be the case with that highest human activity in art and science if their exclusive privilege were appropriated by one caste, with this difference only, that in bodily food there cannot be too great digressions from the natural ; bread as well as onions, though unsavory food, is still eatable : but in mental food, there may be great digressions ; and some men

may for a long time feed upon an unnecessary, or even hurtful and poisonous, mental food ; they themselves may slowly kill themselves with opium or with spirits, and this sort of food they may offer to the masses of the people.

This very thing has happened with us. And it has happened because men of art and science are in privileged conditions ; because art and science in our world are not that mental activity of all mankind, without any exception, who separate their best powers for the service of art and science : but it is the activity of a small company of men having the monopoly of these occupations, and calling themselves men of art and science ; and therefore they have perverted the very conceptions of art and science, and lost the sense of their own calling, and are merely occupied in amusing, and saving from burdensome dulness, a small company of parasites.

Since men have existed they have always had science, in the plainest and largest sense of the word. Science, as the sum of all human information, has always been in existence ; and without it life is not conceivable, and there is no necessity whatever either to attack or defend it.

But the fact is this, that the region of this knowledge is so various, so much information of all kinds enters into it, from the information how to obtain iron up to the knowledge about the movements of the celestial bodies, that man would be lost among all this varied information if he had no clue which could help him to decide which of all these kinds of information is more, and which less, important.

And, therefore, the highest wisdom of men has always consisted in finding out the clue according to which must be arranged the information of men, and by which decided what kinds of information are more, and what are less, important. And this, which has directed all other knowledge, men have always called science in the strictest sense of the word. And such science has always been, up to the present time, in human societies which have left the savage state behind them. Since mankind

has existed, in every nation teachers have appeared to form science in this strict sense, — the science about what it is most necessary for men to know. This science has always had for its object the inquiry as to what was the destiny, and therefore the true welfare, of each man and of all men. This science has served as a clue in determining the importance and the expression of all other sciences. The kinds of information and the art which coöperated with the science of man's destiny and welfare were considered highest in public opinion.

Such was the science of Confucius, Buddha, Moses, Socrates, Christ, Mohammed, — science such as it has been understood by all men except by our own circle of so-called educated people.

Such a science has not only always occupied the first place, but it is the one science which has determined the importance of other sciences. And this, not at all because so-called learned men of our time imagine that it is only deceitful priests and teachers of this science who have given it such an importance, but because, indeed, as every one can learn by his own inward experience, without the science of man's destiny and welfare there cannot be any determining of other values, or any choice of art and science for man. And, therefore, there cannot be any study of science, for there are *innumerable* quantities of subjects to which science may be applied. I italicize the word *innumerable*, as I use it in its exact value.

Without knowledge as to what constitutes the calling and welfare of all men, all other arts and sciences become, as is really the case at present with us, only an idle and pernicious amusement. Mankind have been living long, and they have never been living without a science relative to the calling and welfare of men : it is true that the science of the welfare of men to a superficial observation appears to be different with Buddhists, Brahmins, Hebrews, Christians, with the followers of Confucius and those of Laotse, though one need only reflect on these teachings in order to see their essential unity; where men have left the savage state behind

them, we find this science ; and now of a sudden it turns out that modern men have decided that this very science which has been till now the guide of all human information, is that which is in the way of everything.

Men build houses : one architect makes one estimate, another makes a second, and so on. The estimates are a little different, but they are separately correct ; and every one sees that, if each estimate is fulfilled, the house will be erected. Such architects are Confucius, Buddha, Moses, Christ. And now some men come and assure us that the chief thing to come by is the absence of any estimate, and that men ought to build anyhow, according to eyesight. And this "anyhow" these men call the most exact science, as the Pope terms himself the "most holy."

Men deny every science, the most essential science of man's calling and welfare ; and this denial of science they call science. Since men have existed, great intellects have always appeared, which, in the struggle with the demands of their reason and conscience, have put to themselves questions concerning the calling and welfare, not only of themselves individually, but of every man. What does that Power which created me require from me and from each man ? And what am I to do in order to satisfy the craving ingrafted in me for a personal and common welfare ?

They have asked themselves, I am a whole and a part of something unfathomable, infinite : what are to be my relations to other parts similar to me, — to men and to the whole ?

And from the voice of conscience and from reason, and from considerations on what men have said who lived before, and from contemporaries who have asked themselves the same questions, these great teachers have deduced teachings, — plain, clear, intelligible to all men, and always such as could be put into practice.

The world is full of such men. All living men put to themselves the question, How am I to reconcile my own demands for personal life with conscience and reason, which demand the common good of all men ? And out

of this common travail are evolved slowly, but unceasingly, new forms of life, satisfying more and more the demands of reason and conscience.

And of a sudden a new caste of men appears, who say, All these are nonsense, and are to be left behind. This is the deductive way of thinking (though wherein lies the difference between the inductive and the deductive way of thinking, nobody ever has been able to understand), and this is also the method of the theological and metaphysical periods.

All that men have understood by inward experience, and have related to each other concerning the consciousness of the law of their own life (functional activity, in their cant phrase); all that from the beginning of the world has been done in this direction by the greatest intellects of mankind, — all these are trifles, having no weight whatever.

According to this new teaching, You are a cell of an organism, and the problem of your reasonable activity consists in trying to ascertain your functional activity. In order to ascertain this, you must make observations outside yourself.

The fact that you are a cell which thinks, suffers, speaks, and understands, and that for that very reason you can inquire of another similar speaking, suffering cell whether he or she suffers and rejoices in the same way as yourself, and that thus you may verify your own experience; and the fact that you may make use of what the speaking cells, who lived and suffered before you, wrote on the subject; and your knowledge that millions of cells, agreeing with what the past cells have written, confirm your own experience, that you yourself are a living cell, who always, by a direct inward experience, apprehend the correctness or incorrectness of your own functional activity, — all this means nothing, we are told: it is all a false and evil method.

The true scientific method is this: If you wish to learn in what consists your functional activity, what is your destiny and welfare, and what the destiny of mankind, and of the whole world, then first you must cease

to listen to the voice and demands of your conscience and of your reason, which manifest themselves inwardly to you and to your fellow-men; you must leave off believing all the great teachers of humanity have said about their own conscience and reason, and you must consider all this to be nonsense, and begin at the beginning.

And in order to begin from the beginning, you have to observe through a microscope the movements of amœbæ and the cells of tapeworms; or, still easier, you must believe everything that people with the diploma of infallibility may tell you about them. And observing the movements of these amœbæ and cells, or reading what others have seen, you must ascribe to these cells your own human feelings and calculations as to what they desire, what are their tendencies, their reflections and calculations, their habits; and from these *observations* (in which each word contains some mistake of thought or of expression), according to analogy, you must deduce what is your own destiny, and what that of other cells similar to you.

In order to be able to understand yourself, you must study not merely the tapeworm which you see, but also microscopic animalcules which you cannot see, and the transformation from one set of beings into another, which neither you nor anybody else has ever seen, and which you certainly will never see.

The same holds good with art. Wherever a true science has existed, it has been expressed by art. Since men have existed they have always separated out of all their activities, from their varied information, the chief expression of science, the knowledge of man's destination and welfare; and art, in the strict sense of the word, has been the expression of this.

Since men have existed, there have always been persons particularly sensitive to the teaching of man's welfare and destiny, who have expressed in word, and upon psaltery and cymbals, their human struggle with deceit which led them aside from their true destiny, and their sufferings in this struggle, their hopes about the victory

of good, their despair about the triumph of evil, and their raptures in expectation of coming welfare.

Since men have existed, the true art, that which has been valued by men most highly, had no other destiny than to be the expression of science on man's destiny and welfare.

Always down to the present time art has served the teaching of life (afterward called religion), and it has only been this art which men have valued so highly.

But contemporaneously with the fact that in the place of the science of man's destiny and welfare appeared the science of universal knowledge, since science lost its own sense and meaning, and the true science has been scornfully called religion, true art, as an important activity of men, has disappeared.

As long as the church existed, and taught man's calling and welfare, art served the church, and was true; but from the moment it left the church, and began to serve a science which served everything it met, art lost its meaning, and, notwithstanding its old-fashioned claims, and a stupid assertion that art serves merely art itself, and nothing else, it turned out to be a trade which procures luxuries for men, and unavoidably mixes itself with chorography, culinary art, hair-dressing, and cosmetics, the producers of which may call themselves artists with the same right as the poets, painters, and musicians of our day.

Looking back, we see that during thousands of years, from among thousands of millions of men who have lived, there came forth a few like Confucius, Buddha, Solon, Socrates, Solomon, Homer, Isaiah, David. Apparently true artist-producers of spiritual food appear seldom among men, notwithstanding the fact that they appear, not from one caste only, but from among all men; and it is not without cause that mankind have always so highly valued them. And now it turns out that we have no longer any need of all these former great factors of art and science.

Now, according to the law of the division of labor, it is possible to manufacture scientific and artistic factors

almost mechanically; and we shall manufacture, in the space of ten years, more great men of art and science than have been born among all men from the beginning of the world. Nowadays there is a trade corporation of learned men and artists, and they prepare by an improved way all the mental food which is wanted by mankind. And they have prepared so much of it, that there need no longer be any remembrance of the old producers, not only of the very ancient, but of more recent ones, — all this, we are told, was the activity of the theological and metaphysical period: all had to be destroyed, and the true mental activity began some fifty years ago.

And in these fifty years we have manufactured so many great men that in a German university there are more of them than have been in the whole world, and of sciences we have manufactured a great number too; for one need only put to a Greek word the termination *logy*, and arrange the subject according to ready-made paragraphs, and the science is made: we have thus manufactured so many sciences that not only one man cannot know them all, but he cannot even remember all their names, — these names alone would fill a large dictionary; and every day new sciences come into existence.

In this respect we are like that Finnish teacher who taught the children of a landowner the Finnish language instead of the French. He taught very well; but there was one drawback, — that nobody, except himself, understood it.

But of this there is also an explanation: Men do not understand all the utility of the scientific science because they are still under the influence of the theological period of knowledge, that stupid period when all the people of the Hebrew race, as well as the Chinese and Indians and Greeks, understood everything spoken to them by their great teachers.

But whatever may be the cause, the fact is this, — that art and science have always existed among mankind; and when they really existed, then they were necessary and intelligible to all men.

We are busy about something which we call art and science, and it turns out that what we are busy about is neither necessary nor intelligible to men. And therefore, however fine the things we are about may be, we have no right to call them art and science.

CHAPTER XXXVII

BUT it is said to me, "You only give another narrower definition of art and science, which science does not agree with; but even this does not exclude them, and notwithstanding all you say, there still remain the scientific and art activities of men like Galileo, Bruno, Homer, Michael Angelo, Beethoven, Wagner, and other learned men and artists of lesser magnitude, who have devoted all their lives to art and science."

Usually this is said in the endeavor to establish a link connecting the activity of former learned men and artists with the modern ones, trying to forget that new principle of the division of labor by reason of which art and science are occupying now a privileged position.

First of all, it is not possible to establish any such connection between the former factors and the modern ones, as the holy life of the first Christian has nothing in common with the lives of popes: thus, the activity of men like Galileo, Shakespeare, Beethoven, has nothing in common with the activities of men like Tyndall, Hugo, and Wagner. As the Holy Fathers would have denied any connection with the Popes, so the ancient factors of science would have denied any relationship with the modern ones.

And secondly, owing to that importance which art and science ascribe to themselves, we have a very clear standard established by them by means of which we are able to determine whether they do or do not fulfil their destiny; and we therefore decide, not without proofs, but according to their own standard, whether that activity which calls itself art and science has, or has not, any right to call itself thus.

Though the Egyptians or Greek priests performed mysteries known to none but themselves, and said that these mysteries included all art and science, I could not, on the ground of the asserted utility of these to the people, ascertain the reality of their science, because this said science, according to their *ipse dixit*, was a supernatural one; but now we all have a very clear and plain standard, excluding everything supernatural; art and science promise to put forth the mental activity of mankind for the welfare of society or even of the whole of mankind. And therefore we have a right to call only such activity art and science which has this aim in view, and attains it. And therefore, however those learned men and artists may call themselves, who excogitate the theory of penal laws, of state laws, and of the laws of nations, who invent new guns and explosive substances, who compose obscene operas and operettas, or similarly obscene novels, we have no right to call such activity the activity of art and science, because this activity has not in view the welfare of society or of mankind, but on the contrary it is directed to the harm of men. Therefore none of these efforts are either art or science.

In like manner, however these learned men may call themselves who in their simplicity are occupied during all their lives with the investigations of the microscopical animalcule and of telescopic and spectral phenomena; or those artists who, after having carefully investigated the monuments of old times, are busy writing historical novels, making pictures, concocting symphonies and beautiful verses, — all these men, notwithstanding all their zeal, cannot be, according to the definition of their own science, called men of science and art; first, because their activity in science for the sake of science, and of art for art, has not in view man's welfare; and secondly, because we do not see any results of these activities for the welfare of society or mankind.

And the fact that sometimes something comes of their activities useful or agreeable for some men, as out of everything something useful and agreeable may re-

sult for some men, by no means gives us any right, according to their own scientific definition, to consider them to be men of art and science.

In like manner, however those men may call themselves who excogitate the application of electricity to lighting, heating, and motion; or who invent some new chemical combinations, producing dynamite or fine colors; men who correctly play Beethoven's symphonies; who act on the stage or paint portraits well, domestic pictures, landscapes, and other pictures; who compose interesting novels, the object of which is merely to amuse rich people, — the activity of these men, I say, cannot be called art and science, because this activity is not directed, like the activity of the brain in the organism, to the welfare of the whole, but is guided merely by personal gain, privileges, money, which one obtains for the inventing and producing of so-called art; and therefore this activity cannot possibly be separated from other covetous, personal activity, which adds agreeable things to life, like the activity of innkeepers, jockeys, milliners, and prostitutes, and so on, because the activity of the first, the second, and the last do not come under the definition of art and science, on the ground of the division of labor, which promises to serve for the welfare of all mankind.

The scientific definition of art and science is a correct one; but, unluckily, the activity of modern art and science does not come under it. Some produce directly hurtful things, others, useless things; and a third party invent trifles fit only for the use of rich people. They may all be very good persons, but they do not fulfil what they, according to their own definition, have taken upon themselves to fulfil; and therefore they have as little right to call themselves men of art and science as the modern clergy, who do not fulfil their duties, have the right to consider themselves the bearers and teachers of divine truth.

And it is not difficult to understand why the factors of modern art and science have not fulfilled, and cannot fulfil, their calling. They do not fulfil it, because they

have converted their duty into a right. The scientific and art activities, in their true sense, are fruitful only when they ignore their rights and know only their duties. Mankind value this activity so highly only because it is a self-denying one.

If men are really called to serve others by *mental* labor, they will have to suffer in performing this labor, because it is only by sufferings that spiritual fruit is produced. Self-denying and suffering are the lot and portion of a thinker and an artist, because their object is the welfare of men. Men are wretched: they suffer and go to ruin. One cannot wait and lose one's time.

A thinker and an artist will never sit on the heights of Olympus, as we are apt to imagine: he must suffer in company with men in order to find salvation or consolation. He will suffer because he is constantly in anxiety and agitation: he might have found out and told what would give happiness to men, might have saved them from suffering; and he has neither found it out nor said it, and to-morrow it may be too late — he may die. And therefore suffering and self-sacrifice will always be the lot of the thinker and the artist.

Not that man will become a thinker and an artist who is brought up in an establishment where learned men and artists are created (but, in reality, they create only destroyers of art and science), and who obtains a diploma, and is well provided for, for life, but he who would gladly abstain from thinking, and expressing that which is ingrafted in his soul, but which he cannot overlook, being drawn to it by two irresistible powers, — his own inward impulse and the wants of men.

Thinkers and artists cannot be sleek, fat men, enjoying themselves, and self-conceited. Spiritual and mental activity, and their expression, are really necessary for others, and are the most difficult of men's callings, — a cross, as it is called in the Gospel.

And the only one certain characteristic of the presence of a calling is the self-denying, the sacrifice of one's self in order to manifest the power ingrafted in man for the benefit of others. To teach how many insects there

are in the world, and observe the spots on the sun, to write novels and operas, can be done without suffering; but to teach men their welfare, which entirely consists in self-denial, and in serving others, and to express powerfully this teaching, cannot be done without self-denial.

The Church existed in her purity as long as her teachers endured patiently and suffered; but as soon as they became fat and sleek, their teaching activity was ended. "Formerly," say the people, "priests were of gold, and chalices of wood; now chalices are of gold, and priests of wood." It was not in vain that Christ died on a cross: it is not in vain that sacrifice and suffering conquer everything.

And as for our art and sciences, they are provided for: they have diplomas, and everybody is only thinking about how to provide still better for them; that is, to make it impossible for them to serve men. A true art and a true science have two unmistakable characteristics,—the first, an interior one, that a minister of art or science fulfils his calling, not for the sake of gain, but with self-denial; and the second, an exterior one, that his productions are intelligible to all men, whose welfare he is aiming at.

Whatever men may consider to be their destiny and welfare, science will be the teacher of this destiny and welfare, and art the expression of this teaching. The laws of Solon, of Confucius, are science; the teachings of Moses, of Christ, are science; the temples in Athens, the psalms of David, church worship, are art; but finding out the fourth dimension of matter, and tabulating chemical combinations, and so on, have never been, and never will be, science.

The place of true science is occupied, in our time, by theology and law; the place of true art is occupied by the church and state ceremonies, in which nobody believes, and which are not considered seriously by anybody: and that which with us is called art and science, is only the productions of idle minds and feelings which have in view to stimulate similarly idle minds and feel-

ings, and which are unintelligible and dumb for the people, because they have not their welfare in view.

Since we have known the lives of men, we always and everywhere have found a ruling false doctrine, calling itself science; which does not show men the true meaning of life, but rather hides it from them.

So it was among the Egyptians, the Indians, the Chinese, and partially among the Greeks (sophists); and among the mystics, Gnostics, and cabalists; in the Middle Ages, in theology, scholasticism, alchemy; and so on down to our days. How fortunate indeed are we to be living in such a peculiar time, when that mental activity which calls itself science is not only free from errors, but, as we are assured, is in a state of peculiar progress! Does not this good fortune come from the fact that man cannot and will not see his own deformities? While of the sciences of theologians, and that of cabalists, nothing is left but empty words, why should we be so particularly fortunate?

The characteristics of our and of former times are quite similar: there is the same self-conceit and blind assurance that we only are on the true way, and that only with us true knowledge begins; there are the same expectations that we shall presently discover something very wonderful; and there is the same exposure of our error in the fact that all our wisdom remains with us, while the masses of the people do not understand it, and neither accept nor want it. Our position is a very difficult one, but why should we not look it in the face?

It is time to come to our senses, and to look more closely to ourselves. We are, indeed, nothing but scribes and Pharisees, who, sitting in Moses' seat, and having the key of the kingdom of God, do not enter themselves, and refuse entrance to others.

We, priests of art and science, are most wretched deceivers, who have much less right to our position than the most cunning and depraved priests ever had.

For our privileged position there is no excuse whatever: we have taken up this position by a kind of swindling, and we retain it by deceit. Pagan priests, the clergy, as well

Russian as Roman Catholic, however depraved they may have been, had rights to their position, because they profess to teach men about life and salvation. And we, who have cut the ground from under their feet, and proved to men that they were deceivers, we have taken their place, and not only do not teach men about life, we even acknowledge that there is no necessity for them to learn. We suck the blood of the people, and for this we teach our children Greek and Latin grammars, in order that they also may continue the same parasitic life which we are living.

We say, There have been castes, we will abolish them. But what means the fact that some men and their children work, and other men and their children do not work?

Bring a Hindu who does not know our language, and show him the Russian and the European lives of many generations, and he will recognize the existence of two important definite castes, of working-people and of non-working-people, as they are in existence in his own country. As in his country, so also among us, the right of not working is acquired through a peculiar initiation which we call art and science, and, generally, education.

This education it is, and the perversions of reason associated with it, that have brought us to this wonderful folly, whence it has come to pass that we do not see what is so plain and certain. We are eating up the lives of our brethren, and consider ourselves to be Christians, humane, educated, and quite righteous people.

✿ CHAPTER XXXVIII

WHAT is to be done? What must we do?

This question, which includes the acknowledgment of the fact that our life is bad and unrighteous, and at the same time hints that there is no possibility of changing it,—this question I hear everywhere, and therefore I chose it for the title of my work.

I have described my own sufferings, my search, and the answer which I have found to this question.

I am a man, like all others; and if I distinguish myself from an average man of my own circle in anything, it is chiefly in the fact that I, more than this average man, have served and indulged the false teaching of our world, that I have been praised by the men of the prevalent school of teaching, and that therefore I must be more depraved, and have gone farther astray, than most of my fellows.

Therefore I think that the answer to this question which I have found for myself will do for all sincere persons who will put the same question to themselves. First of all, to the question, "What is to be done?" I answer that we must neither deceive other men nor ourselves; that we must not be afraid of the truth, whatever the result may be.

We all know what it is to deceive other men; and notwithstanding this we do deceive from morning to evening, — "Not at home," when I am in; "Very glad," when I am not at all glad; "Esteemed," when I do not esteem; "I have no money," when I have it, and so on.

We consider the deception of others, particularly a certain kind of deception, to be evil; but we are not afraid to deceive ourselves: but the worst direct lie to men, seeing its result, is nothing in comparison with that lie to ourselves according to which we shape our lives. Now, this very lie we must avoid if we wish to be able to answer the question, "*What is to be done?*"

And, indeed, how am I to answer the question as to what is to be done, when everything I do, all my life, is based upon a lie, and I carefully give out this lie for truth, to others and to myself? Not to lie in this sense means to be not afraid of truth; not to invent excuses, and not to accept excuses invented by others, in order to hide from one's self the deduction of reason and conscience; not to be afraid of contradicting all our environment, and of being left alone with reason and conscience; not to be afraid of that condition to which

truth and conscience lead us ; however dreadful it may be, it cannot be worse than that which is based upon deceit.

To avoid lying, for men in our privileged position of mental labor, means not to be afraid of learning. Perhaps we owe so much that we should never be able to pay it all ; but, however much we may owe, we must make out our bill ; however far we have gone astray, it is better to return than to continue straying.

Lying to our fellows is always disadvantageous. Every business is always more directly done, and more quickly too, by truth than by lies. Lying to other men makes the matter only more complicated, and retards the decision ; but lying to one's self, which is given out to be the truth, entirely ruins the life of man.

If a man considers a wrong road to be a right one, then his every step only leads him farther from his aim ; a man who has been walking for a long time on a wrong road may find out for himself, or be told by others, that his road is a wrong one ; but if he, being afraid of the thought of how far he has gone astray, tries to assure himself that he may, by following this wrong way, still come across the right one, then he will certainly never find it. If a man becomes afraid of the truth, and, on seeing it, will not acknowledge it, but takes falsehood for truth, then this man will never learn what is to be done.

We, not only rich men, but men in a privileged position, so-called educated men, have gone so far astray that we require either a firm resolution or very great sufferings on our false way in order to come to our senses again, and to recognize the lie by which we live.

I became aware of the lie of our life, thanks to those sufferings to which my wrong road led me ; and, having acknowledged the error of the way on which I was bent, I had the boldness to go, first in theory, then in reality, wherever my reason and conscience led me, without any deliberation as to whither they were tending.

And I was rewarded.

All the complex, disjointed, intricate, and meaningless phenomena of life surrounding me became, of a sudden, clear; and my position, formerly so strange and vile, among these phenomena became, of a sudden, natural and easy.

And in this new situation my activity has exactly determined itself, but it is quite a different activity from that which appeared possible to me before; it is a new activity, far more quiet, affectionate, and joyous. The very thing which frightened me before, now attracts me.

And therefore I think that every one who sincerely puts to himself the question, "What is to be done?" and in answering this question does not lie or deceive himself, but goes wherever his reason *and conscience* may lead him, that man has already answered the question.

If he will only avoid deceiving himself, he will find out what to do, where to go, and how to act. There is only one thing which may hinder him in finding an answer,—that is, a too high estimate of himself and his own position. So it was with me; and therefore the second answer to the question, "What is to be done?" resulting from the first, consisted for me in repenting, in the full meaning of this word, that is, entirely changing the estimate of my own position and activity: instead of considering such to be useful and of importance, we must come to acknowledge it to be harmful and trifling; instead of considering ourselves educated, we must get to see our ignorance; instead of imagining ourselves to be kind and moral, we must acknowledge that we are immoral and cruel; instead of our importance, we must see our own insignificance.

I say, that besides avoiding lying to myself, I had moreover to *repent*, because, though the one results from the other, the wrong idea about my great importance was so much a part of my own nature, that until I had sincerely repented, and had put aside that wrong estimate of myself which I had, I did not see the enormity of the lie of which I had been guilty.

It was only when I repented,—that is, left off consid-

ering myself to be a peculiar man, and began to consider myself to be like *all* other men, — it was then that my way became clear to me. Before this, I was not able to answer the question, "What is to be done?" because the very question itself was put incorrectly.

Before I repented, I had put the question thus: "What activity should I choose, I, the man with the education I have acquired? How can I compensate by this education and these talents for what I have been taking away from the people?"

This question was a false one, because it included a wrong idea as to my not being like other men, but a peculiar man, called to serve other men with those talents and that education which I had acquired in forty years.

I had put the question to myself, but in reality I had already answered it in advance by having determined beforehand the kind of activity agreeable to myself by which I was called upon to serve men. I really asked myself, "How have I, so fine a writer, one so very well informed, and with such talents, how can I utilize them for the benefit of mankind?"

But the question ought to have been put thus, as it would have to be put to a learned rabbi who had studied all the Talmud, and knew the exact number of the letters in the Holy Scripture, and all the subtleties of his science: "What have I to do, who, from unlucky circumstances, have lost my best years in study instead of accustoming myself to labor, in learning the French language, the piano, grammar, geography, law, poetry; in reading novels, romances, philosophical theories, and in performing military exercises? what have I to do, who have passed the best years of my life in idle occupations, depraving the soul? what have I to do, notwithstanding these unlucky conditions of the past, in order to requite those men, who, during all this time, have fed and clothed me, and who still continue to feed and to clothe me?"

If the question had been put thus, after I had repented, "What have I, so ruined a man, to do?" the

answer would have been easy: First of all, I must try to get my living honestly, — that is, learn not to live upon the shoulders of others; and while learning this, and after I have learned it, to try on every occasion to be of use to men with my hands and with my feet, as well as with my brain and my heart, and with all of me that is wanted by men.

And therefore I say that for one of my own circle, besides avoiding lying to others and to ourselves, it is necessary moreover to repent, to lay aside that pride about our education, refinement, and talents, not considering ourselves to be benefactors of the people, advanced men, who are ready to share our useful acquirements with the people, but to acknowledge ourselves to be entirely guilty, ruined, good-for-nothing men, who desire to turn over a new leaf, and not to be benefactors of the people, but to cease to offend and to humiliate them. Very often good young people, who sympathize with the negative part of my writings, put to me the question, "What must I then do? What have I, who have finished my study in the university or in some other high establishment, — what have I to do in order to be useful?"

These young people ask the question; but in the depths of their souls they have already decided that that education which they have received is their great advantage, and that they wish to serve the people by this very advantage.

And therefore there is one thing which they do not do, — honestly and critically examine what they call their education, by asking themselves whether it is a good or a bad thing.

But if they do this, they will be unavoidably led to deny their education, and to begin to learn anew; and this is alone what is wanted. They never will be able to answer the question as to what there is to be done, because they put it wrongly. The question should be put thus: "How can I, a helpless, useless man, seeing now the misfortune of having lost my best years in studying the scientific Talmud, pernicious for soul and

body, how can I rectify this mistake, and learn to serve men?" But the question is always put thus: "How can I, who have acquired so much fine information, how can I be useful to men with this my information?"

And, therefore, a man will never answer the question, "What is to be done?" until he leaves off deceiving himself, and repents. And repentance is not dreadful, even as truth is not dreadful, but it is equally beneficent and fruitful of good. We need only accept the whole truth and fully repent in order to understand that in life no one has any rights or privileges, and that there is no end of duties, and no limits to them, and that the first and unquestionable duty of a man is to take a part in the struggle with nature for his own life, and for the lives of other men. And this acknowledgment of men's duty forms the essence of the third answer to the question, "What is to be done?"

I have tried to avoid deceiving myself. I have endeavored to extirpate the remainders of the false estimate of the importance of my education and talents, and to repent; but before answering the question, *What is to be done?* stands a new difficulty.

There are so many things to be done that one requires to know what is to be done in particular. And the answer to this question has been given me by the sincere repentance of the evil in which I have been living.

What is to be done? What is there exactly to be done? everybody keeps asking; and I, too, kept asking this, while, under the influence of a high opinion of my own calling, I had not seen that my first and unquestionable business is to earn my living, clothing, heating, building, and so forth, and in doing this to serve others as well as myself, because, since the world has existed, the first and unquestionable duty of every man has been comprised in this.

In this one business, man receives, if he has already begun to take part in it, the full satisfaction of all the bodily and mental wants of his nature: to feed, clothe, take care of himself and of his family, will satisfy his

bodily wants; to do the same for others, will satisfy his spiritual.

Every other activity of man is only lawful when these first have been satisfied. In whatever department a man thinks to be his calling, whether in governing the people, in protecting his countrymen, in officiating at divine services, in teaching, in inventing the means of increasing the delights of life, in discovering the laws of the universe, in incorporating eternal truths in artistic images, the very first and the most unquestionable duty of a reasonable man will always consist in taking part in the struggle with nature for preserving his own life and the lives of other men.

This duty will always rank first, because the most necessary thing for men is life: and therefore, in order to protect and to teach men, and to make their lives more agreeable, it is necessary to keep this very life; while by not taking part in the struggle, and by swallowing up the labor of others, lives are destroyed. And it is folly to endeavor to serve men by destroying their lives.

Man's duty to acquire in the struggle with nature the means of living will always be unquestionably the very first of all duties, because it is the law of life, the violation of which unavoidably brings with it a punishment by destroying the bodily or mental life of man. If a man, living alone, free himself from the duty of struggling with nature, he will at once be punished by his body perishing.

But if a man free himself from this duty by compelling other men to fulfil it for him, in ruining their lives, he will be at once punished by the destruction of his reasonable life, — that is, the life which has a reasonable sense in it.

I had been so perverted by my antecedents, and this first and unquestionable law of God or nature is so hidden in our present world, that the fulfilling of it had seemed to me strange, and I was afraid and ashamed of it, as if the fulfilment, and not the violation, of this eternal, unquestionable law were strange, unnatural, and shameful. At first it seemed to me that, in order to

fulfil this law, some sort of accommodation was necessary, some established association of fellow-thinkers, the consent of the family, and life in the country (not in town): then I felt ashamed, as if I were putting myself forward in performing things so unusual to our life as bodily labor, and I did not know how to begin.

But I needed only to understand that this was not some exclusive activity, which I had to invent and to arrange, but that it was merely returning from a false condition in which I had been to a natural one, merely rectifying that lie in which I had been living, — I had only to acknowledge all this, in order that all the difficulties should vanish.

It was not at all necessary to arrange and accommodate anything, or to wait for the consent of other people, because everywhere, in whatever condition I was, there were men who fed, dressed, and warmed me as well as themselves; and everywhere, under all circumstances, I was able to do these for myself and for them, if I had sufficient time and strength.

Nor could I feel a false shame in performing matters unusual and strange to me, because, in not doing so, I already experienced, not a false, but a real, shame.

And having come to this acknowledgment, and to the practical deduction from it, I had been fully rewarded for not having been afraid of the deductions of reason, and for having gone whither they led me.

Having come to this practical conclusion, I was struck by the facility and simplicity of the solution of all those problems which had formerly seemed to me so difficult and complicated. To the question, "What have we to do?" I received a very plain answer: Do first what is necessary for yourself; arrange all you can do by yourself, — your tea-urn, stove, water, and clothes.

To the question, "Would not this seem strange to those who had been accustomed to do all this for me?" it appeared that it was strange only during a week, and after a week it seemed more strange for me to return to my former condition.

In answer to the question, "Is it necessary to organ-

ize this physical labor, to establish a society in a village upon this basis?" it appeared that it was not at all necessary to do all this; that if the labor does not aim at rendering idleness possible, and at utilizing other men's labor, as is the case with men who save up money, but merely the satisfying of necessities, then such labor will naturally induce people to leave towns for the country, where this labor is most agreeable and productive.

There was also no need to establish a society, because a working-man will naturally associate with other working people. In answer to the question, "Would not this labor take up all my time, and would it not deprive me of the possibility of that mental activity which I am so fond of, and to which I have become accustomed, and which in moments of self-conceit I consider to be useful to others?" the answer will be quite an unexpected one. In proportion to bodily exercise the energy of my mental activity increased, having freed itself from all that was superfluous.

In fact, having spent eight hours in physical labor, — half a day, — which formerly I used to spend in endeavoring to struggle with dullness, there still remained for me eight hours, out of which in my circumstances I required five for mental labor; and if I, a very prolific writer, who had been doing nothing during forty years but writing, and who had written three hundred printed sheets, that if during these forty years I had been doing ordinary work along with working people, then, not taking into consideration winter evenings and holidays, if I had been reading and learning during the five hours a day, and written only on holidays two pages a day (and I have sometimes written sixteen pages a day), I should have written the same three hundred printed sheets in fourteen years.

A wonderful thing, perhaps, but a most simple arithmetical calculation which every boy of seven years of age may do, and which I had never done. Day and night have together twenty-four hours; we sleep eight hours; there remain sixteen hours. If any man labor mentally five hours a day, he will do a vast amount of

business; what do we, then, do during the remaining eleven hours?

So it appears that physical labor not only does not exclude the possibility of mental activity, but improves and stimulates it.

In answer to the question whether this physical labor would deprive me of many innocent enjoyments proper to man, such as the enjoyment of art, the acquirement of knowledge, of social intercourse, and, generally, of the happiness of life, it was really quite the reverse: the more intense my physical labor was, the more it approached that labor which is considered the hardest, that is, agricultural labor, the more I acquired enjoyments, knowledge, and the closer and more affectionate was my intercourse with mankind, and the more happiness did I feel in life.

In answer to the question (which I hear so often from men who are not quite sincere), "What result can there be from such an awfully small drop in the sea? what is all my personal physical labor in comparison with the sea of labor which I swallow up?"

To this question I also received a very unexpected answer.

It appeared that as soon as I had made physical labor the ordinary condition of my life, then at once the greatest part of my false and expensive habits and wants which I had, while I had been physically idle, ceased of themselves, without any endeavor on my part. To say nothing of the habit of turning day into night, and *vice versa*, of my bedding, clothes, my conventional cleanliness, which all became impossible and embarrassing when I began to labor physically, both the quantity and the quality of my food was totally changed. Instead of the sweet, rich, delicate, complicated, and highly spiced food which I was formerly fond of, I now required and obtained plain food as the most agreeable, — sour cabbage soup, porridge, black bread, tea with a bit of sugar.

So that, to say nothing of the example of common working-men, who are satisfied with little, with whom I came into closer intercourse, my very wants themselves

were gradually changed by my life of labor ; so that my drop of physical labor, in proportion to my growing accustomed to this labor and acquiring the ways of it, became indeed more perceptible in the ocean of common labor ; and in proportion as my labor grew more fruitful, my demands for other men's labor grew less and less, and my life naturally, without effort or privation, came nearer to that simple life of which I could not even have dreamed without fulfilling the law of labor.

It became apparent that my former most expensive demands — the demands of vanity and amusement — were the direct result of an idle life. With physical labor there was no room for vanity, and no need for amusement, because my time was agreeably occupied ; and after weariness, simple rest while drinking tea, or reading a book, or conversing with the members of my family, was far more agreeable than the theater, playing at cards, concerts, or large parties.

In answer to the question, " Would not this unusual labor be hurtful to my health, which is necessary for me in order that I may serve men ? " it appeared that, in spite of the positive assurance of eminent doctors that hard physical labor, especially at my age, might have the worst results (and that Swedish gymnastics, riding, and other expedients intended to supply the natural conditions of man, would be far better), the harder I worked, the stronger, sounder, more cheerful, and kinder I felt myself.

So that it became undoubtedly certain that just as all those inventions of the human mind, such as newspapers, theaters, concerts, parties, balls, cards, magazines, novels, are nothing else than means to sustain the mental life of men out of its natural condition of labor for others, in the same way all the hygienic and medical inventions of the human mind for the accommodation of food, drink, dwelling, ventilation, warming of rooms, clothes, medicines, mineral waters, gymnastics, electric and other cures, are all merely means to sustain the bodily life of man out of its natural conditions of labor ; that all these are nothing else than an establishment

hermetically closed, in which, by the means of chemical apparatus, the evaporation of water for the plants is arranged when you only need to open the window, and do that which is natural, not only to men, but to beasts too ; in other words, having absorbed the food, and thus produced a charge of energy, to discharge it by muscular labor.

All the profound thoughts of hygiene and of the art of healing for the men of our circle are like the efforts of a mechanic, who, having stopped all the valves of an overheated engine, should invent something to prevent this engine from bursting.

When I had plainly understood all this, it became to me ridiculous, that I, through a long series of doubt, research, and much thinking, had arrived at this extraordinary truth, — that if man has eyes, they are to be seen through ; ears to hear by ; feet to walk with, and hands and back to work with ; and that if man will not use these, his members, for what they are meant, then it will be worse for him. I came to this conclusion, that with us, privileged people, the same thing has happened which happened to the horses of a friend of mine : The steward, who was not fond of horses, and did not understand anything about them, having received from his master orders to prepare the best cobs for sale, chose the best out of the drove of horses, and put them into the stable ; fed them upon oats ; but being over-anxious, he trusted them to nobody, neither rode them himself, nor drove nor led them.

All of these horses became, of course, good for nothing.

The same has happened to us, with this difference, — that you cannot deceive horses, and in order not to let them out, they must be secured ; and we are kept in unnatural and hurtful conditions by all sorts of temptations, which fasten and hold us as with chains.

We have arranged for ourselves a life which is against the moral and physical nature of man, and we use all the powers of our mind in order to assure men that this life is a real one. All that we call culture, — our science

and arts for improving the delights of life, — all these are only meant to deceive man's natural acquirements: all that we call hygiene, and the art of healing, are endeavors to deceive the natural physical want of human nature.

But these deceits have their limit, and we are come to these limits. "If such be real human life, then it is better not to live at all," says the fashionable philosophy of Schopenhauer and Hartman. "If such be life, it is better for future generations, too, not to live," says the indulgent healing art, and invents means to destroy women's fecundity.

In the Bible the law to human beings is expressed thus: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," and "In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children."

The peasant Bondaref, who wrote an article about this, threw great light upon the wisdom of this sentence. During the whole of my life, two thinking men — Russians — have exercised a great moral influence over me: they have enriched my thoughts, and enlightened my contemplation of the world.

These men were neither poets, nor learned men, nor preachers: they were two remarkable men, both living peasants, — Sutaief and Bondaref. But "*nous avons changé tout ça*," as says one of Molière's personages, talking at random about the healing art, and saying that the liver is on the left side, "we have changed all that." Men need not work — all work will be done by machines; and women need not bring forth children. The healing art will teach different means of avoiding this, and there are already too many people in the world.

In the Krapivensky district,¹ there lives a ragged peasant who during the war was a purchaser of meat for a commissary of stores. Having become acquainted with this functionary, and having seen his comfortable life, he became mad, and now thinks that he, too, can live as gentlemen do, without working, being provided for by the Emperor.

¹ Count Tolstoï's village of Yasnaya Polyana is situated in this district. — AM. ED.

This peasant now calls himself "the Most Serene Marshal Prince Blokhin, purveyor of war-stores of all kinds."

He says of himself that he has gone through all ranks, and for his services during the war he has to receive from the Emperor an unlimited bank-account, clothes, uniforms, horses, carriages, tea, servants, and all kinds of provision. When anybody asks him whether he would like to work a little, he always answers, "Thanks: the peasants will attend to all that." When we say to him that the peasants also may not be disposed to work, he answers, "Machines have been invented to ease the labor of peasants. They have no difficulty in their business." When we ask him what he is living for, he answers, "To pass away the time."

I always consider this man as a mirror. I see in him myself and all my class: to pass through all ranks in order to live, to pass away the time, and to receive an unlimited bank-account, while peasants attend to everything, and find it easy to do so, because of the invention of machines.

This is the very form of the foolish belief of men of our class. When we ask what have we particularly to do, we are in reality asking nothing, but only asserting—not so sincerely indeed as the Most Serene Marshal Prince Blokhin, who had passed through all ranks, and lost his mind—that we do not wish to do anything.

He who has come to his senses cannot ask this, because from one side all that he makes use of has been done, and is being done, by the hands of men: on the other side, as soon as a healthy man has got up and breakfasted, he feels the inclination to work, as well with his feet as with his hands and brain. In order to find work, he has only not to restrain himself from labor. Only he who considers labor to be a shame, like the lady who asked her guest not to trouble herself to open the door, but to wait till she called a servant to do it, only such persons can ask what is there to be done in particular.

The difficulty is not in inventing some work,—every one has enough to do for himself and for others,—but

in losing this criminal view of life, that we eat and sleep for our own pleasure, and in appropriating that simple and correct view in which every working-person grows up, that man first of all is a machine which is charged with food, in order to earn his living, and that therefore it is shameful, difficult, and impossible to eat and not to work; that to eat and not to work is a most dangerous state, and as bad as incendiarism.

It is necessary merely to have this consciousness, and we shall find work will always be pleasant, and capable of satisfying all the wants of our soul and body.

I picture to myself the whole matter thus: Every man's day is divided by his meals into four parts, or four stages as it is called by the peasants: First, before breakfast; secondly, from breakfast to dinner; thirdly, from dinner to poldnik (a slight evening meal between dinner and supper); and fourthly, from poldnik to night. The activity of man to which he is drawn is also divided into four kinds: First, the activity of the muscles, the labor of the hands, feet, shoulders, back, — hard labor, by which one perspires; secondly, the activity of the fingers and wrists, the activity of skill and handicraft; thirdly, the activity of the intellect and imagination; fourthly, the activity of intercourse with other men.

And the goods which man makes use of may also be divided into four kinds: First, every man makes use of the productions of hard labor, — bread, cattle, buildings, wells, bridges, and so on; secondly, the productions of handicraft, — clothes, boots, hardware, and so on; thirdly, the productions of mental activity, — science, art; and fourthly, the intercourse with men, acquaintanceship, societies.

And I thought that it would be the best thing so to arrange the occupations of the day that one might be able to exercise all these four faculties, and to return all the four kinds of production of labor, which one makes use of; so that the four parts of the day were devoted, first, to hard labor; secondly, to mental labor; thirdly, to handicraft; fourthly, to the intercourse with men. It would be good if one could so arrange his labor; but if

it is not possible to arrange thus, one thing is important,—to acknowledge the duty of laboring, the duty of making a good use of each part of the day.

I thought that it would be only then that the false division of labor would disappear which now rules our society, and a just division would be established which should not interfere with the happiness of mankind.

I, for instance, have all my life been busy with mental work. I had said to myself that I have thus divided the labor that my special work is writing; that is, mental labor: and all other works necessary for me I left to be done by other men, or rather compelled them to do it. But this arrangement, seemingly so convenient for mental labor, became most inconvenient, especially for mental labor. I have been writing all my life, have accommodated my food, sleep, amusements, with reference to this special labor, and besides this work I did nothing.

The results of which were, first, that I had been narrowing the circle of my observation and information, and often I had not any object to study, and therefore, having had to describe the life of men (the life of men is a continual problem of every mental activity), I felt my ignorance, and had to learn and to ask about such things, which every one not occupied with a special work knows; secondly, it happened that when I sat down to write, I often had no inward inclination to write, and nobody wanted my writing itself, that is, my thoughts, but people merely wanted my name for profits in the magazines.

I made great efforts to write what I could; sometimes I did not succeed at all; sometimes succeeded in writing something very bad, and I felt dissatisfied and dull. But now, since I have acknowledged the necessity of physical labor as well as hard labor, and also that of handicraft, it is all quite different: my time is occupied humbly, but certainly in a useful way, and pleasantly and instructively for me.

And therefore I, for the sake of my specialty, leave off this undoubtedly useful and pleasant occupation only when I feel an inward want, or see a direct demand for

my literary work. And this has improved the quality, and therefore the usefulness and pleasantness, of my special labor.

So that it has happened that my occupation with those physical works, which are necessary for me as well as for every man, not only did not interfere with my special activity, but was a necessary condition of the utility, quality, and pleasantness of this activity.

A bird is so created that it is necessary for it to fly, to walk, to peck, to consider ; and when it does all this, it is satisfied and happy ; then it is a bird. Exactly so with a man when he walks, turns over heavy things, lifts them up, carries them, works with his fingers, eyes, ears, tongue, brain ; then only is he satisfied, then only is he *a man*.

A man who has come to recognize his calling to labor will naturally be inclined to that change of labor which is proper for him for the satisfying of his outward and inward wants, and he will reverse this order only when he feels an irresistible impulse to some special labor, and other men will require from him this labor. The nature of labor is such that the satisfying of all men's wants requires that very alternation of different kinds of labor which renders labor easy and pleasant.

Only the erroneous idea that labor is a curse could lead men to the freeing themselves from some kinds of labor, that is, to the seizure of other men's labor which requires a forced occupation with a special labor from other men which is called nowadays the division of labor.

We have become so accustomed to our false conception of the arrangement of labor that it seems to us that for a bootmaker, a machinist, a writer, a musician, it would be better to be freed from the labor proper to man. Where there is no violence over other men's labor, nor a false belief in the pleasures of idleness, no man for the sake of his special labor will free himself from physical labor necessary for the satisfying of his wants, because special occupation is not a privilege, but a sacrifice of a man's inclination for the sake of his brethren.

A bootmaker in a village having torn himself from

his usual pleasant labor in the field, and having begun his labor of mending or making boots for his neighbors, deprives himself of a pleasant, useful labor in the field for the sake of others, only because he is fond of sewing, and knows that nobody will do it better than he does, and that people will be thankful to him.

But he cannot wish to deprive himself for all his life of the pleasant alternation of labor. The same with the starosta, the machinist, the writer, the learned man.

It is only to us, with our perverted ideas, that it seems, when the master sends his clerk to be a peasant, or government sentences one of its ministers to deportation, that they are punished, and have been dealt with hardly. But in reality they have had a great good done to them, — that is, they have exchanged their heavy special work for a pleasant alternation of labor.

In a natural society all is quite different. I know a commune where the people earn their living themselves. One of the members of this community was more educated than the rest; and they required him to deliver lectures, for which he had to prepare himself during the day, in order to be able to deliver them in the evening. He did it joyfully, feeling that he was useful to others, and that he could do it well. But he got tired of the exclusive mental labor, and his health suffered accordingly. The members of the community therefore pitied him, and asked him to come again and labor in the field.

For men who consider labor to be the essential thing and the joy of life, the ground, the basis, of it will always be the struggle with nature, — not only agricultural labor, but also that of handicraft, mental work, and intercourse with men.

The divergence from one or many of these kinds of labor, and specialties of labor, will be performed only when a man of special gifts, being fond of this work, and knowing that he performs it better than anybody else, will sacrifice his own advantage in order to fulfil the demands of others put directly to him.

Only with such a view of labor, and the natural division

of labor resulting from it, will the curse disappear which we in our imagination have put upon labor; and every labor will always be a joy, because man will do either an unquestionably useful, pleasant, and easy work, or will be conscious that he makes a sacrifice in performing a more difficult special labor for the good of others.

But the division of labor is, it is said, more advantageous. Advantageous for whom? Is it more advantageous to make as quickly as possible as many boots and cotton prints as possible? But who will make these boots and cotton prints? Men who from generation to generation have been making only pinheads? How, then, can it be more advantageous for people? If the question were to make as many cotton prints and pins as possible, it would be so; but the question is, how to make people happy?

The happiness of men consists in life. And life is in labor.

How, then, can the necessity of a painful, oppressing work be advantageous for men? If the question were only for the advantage of some men without any consideration of the welfare of all, then it would be most advantageous for some men to eat others.

The thing most advantageous for all men is that which I wish for myself, — the greatest welfare and the satisfying of all my wants, those of body as well as those of soul, of conscience, and of reason, which are ingrafted in me.

And now, for myself, I have found that for my welfare and for the satisfying of these wants, I need only to be cured of the folly in which I, as well as the Krapivensky madman, have lived, which consisted in the idea that gentlefolk need not work, and that all must be done for them by others, and that, producing nothing, I have to do only what is proper to man, — satisfy my own wants.

And having discovered this, I became persuaded that this labor for the satisfying of my own wants is divisible into various kinds of labor, each of which has its own charm, and is not only not a burden, but serves as rest after some other.

I have divided my labor into four parts parallel to the four parts of the laborer's day's work, which are divided by his meals; and thus I try to satisfy my wants.

These are, then, the answers to the question, "What is to be done?" which I have found for myself.

First, To avoid deceiving myself. However far I have gone astray from that road of life which my reason shows to me, I must not be afraid of the truth.

Secondly, To renounce my own righteousness, my own advantages, peculiarities, distinguishing me from others, and to confess the guilt of such.

Thirdly, To fulfil that eternal, unquestionable law of man, — by laboring with all my being to struggle with nature, to sustain my own life, and the lives of others.

CHAPTER XXXIX

I HAVE now finished, having said all that concerns myself; but I cannot restrain my desire to say that which concerns every one, and to verify by several considerations my own deductions.

I wish to explain why it is I think that a great many of my own class must arrive where I myself am, and I must also speak of what will result if even some few men arrive there; and in the first place, if only men of our circle, our caste, will seriously think the matter out themselves, the younger generation, who seek their own personal happiness, will become afraid of the ever increasing misery of lives which obviously lead them to ruin; scrupulous persons among us (if they would examine themselves more closely) will be terrified at the cruelty and unlawfulness of their own lives, and timid persons will be frightened at the danger of their mode of life.

The misery of our lives! However we, rich men, may try to mend and to support, with the assistance of our science and art, this our false life, it must become weaker every day, unhealthier, and more and more painful: with each year suicide, and the sin against the unborn babe, increase; with each year the new generations

of our class grow weaker, with each year we more and more feel the increasing dullness of our lives.

It is obvious that on this road, with an increase of the comforts and delights of life, of cures, artificial teeth and hair, and so on, there can be no salvation.

This truth has become such a truism, that in newspapers advertisements are printed about stomach powder for rich people, under the title "Blessings of the poor," where they say that only poor people have a good digestion, and the rich need help, and among other things this powder. You cannot ameliorate this matter by any kind of amusements, comforts, powders, but only by turning over a new leaf.

Our lives are in contradiction to our consciences. However much we may try to justify to ourselves our treason against mankind, all our justification falls to pieces before evidence: around us, people are dying from overwork and want; and we destroy the food, clothes, labor of men merely in order to amuse ourselves. And therefore the conscience of a man of our circle, though he may have but a small remainder of it in his breast, cannot be stifled, and poisons all these comforts and charms of life which our suffering and perishing brethren procure for us. But not only does every scrupulous man feel this himself, but he must feel it more acutely at present, because the best part of art and science, that part in which there still remains a sense of its high calling, constantly reminds him of his cruelty, and the unlawfulness of his position.

The old secure justifications are all destroyed; and the new ephemeral justifications of the progress of science for science's sake, and art for art's sake, will not bear the light of plain common sense.

The conscience of men cannot be calmed by new ideas: it can be calmed only by turning over a new leaf, when there will no longer be any necessity for justification.

The danger to our lives! However much we may try to hide from ourselves the plain and most obvious danger of exhausting the patience of those men whom

we oppress; however much we may try to counteract this danger by all sorts of deceit, violence, and flattery, — it is still growing with each day, with each hour, and it has long been threatening us; but now it is so ripe that we are scarcely able to hold our course in a vessel tossed by a roaring and overflowing sea, — a sea which will presently swallow us up in wrath.

The workman's revolution, with the terrors of destruction and murder, not only threatens us, but we have been already living upon its verge during the last thirty years, and it is only by various cunning devices that we have been postponing the crisis.

Such is the state in Europe; such is the state in Russia, because we have no safety-valves. The classes who oppress the people, with the exception of the Tsar, have no longer in the eyes of our people any justification; they all keep up their position merely by violence, cunning, and expediency; but the hatred toward us of the worst representatives of the people, and the contempt of us from the best, is increasing with every hour.

Among the Russian people during the last three or four years, a new word, full of significance, has been circulating: by this word, which I never heard before, people are swearing in the streets, and calling us parasites.

The hatred and contempt of the oppressed people are increasing, and the physical and moral strength of the richer classes are decreasing: the deceit which supports all this is wearing out, and the rich classes have nothing wherewith to comfort themselves. To return to the old order of things is impossible: one thing only remains for those who are not willing to change the course of their lives, and to turn over a new leaf, — to hope that, during their lives, they will fare well enough, after which the people may do as they like. So think the blind crowd of the rich; but the danger is ever increasing, and the awful catastrophe is coming nearer and nearer.

There are three reasons which prove to rich people the necessity of turning over a new leaf: First, the desire for their own personal welfare and that of their

families, which is not secured by the way in which rich people are living; secondly, the inability to satisfy the voice of conscience, which is obviously impossible in the present condition of things; and thirdly, the threatening and constantly increasing danger to life, which cannot be met by any outward means. All these together ought to induce rich people to change their mode of life. This change alone would satisfy the desire of welfare and conscience, and would remove the danger. And there is but one means of making such change,—to leave off deceiving ourselves, to repent, and to acknowledge labor to be, not a curse, but the joyful business of life.

To this it is replied, "What will come from the fact of my physical labor during ten, eight, or five hours, which thousands of peasants would gladly do for the money which I have?"

The first good would be, that you will become livelier, healthier, sounder, kinder; and you will learn that real life from which you have been hiding yourself, or which was hidden from you.

The second good will be, that, if you have a conscience, it will not only not suffer as it suffers now looking at the labor of men, the importance of which we always, from our ignorance, either increase or diminish, but you will constantly experience a joyful acknowledgment that with each day you are more and more satisfying the demands of your conscience, and are leaving behind you that awful state in which so much evil is accumulated in our lives that we feel that we cannot possibly do any good in the world; you will experience the joy of free life, with the possibility of doing good to others; you will open for yourself a way into the regions of the world of morality which has hitherto been shut to you.

The third good will be this, that, instead of constant fear of revenge for your evil deeds, you will feel that you are saving others from this revenge, and are principally saving the oppressed from the cruel feeling of rancor and resentment.

But it is usually said that it would be ridiculous if we, men of our stamp, with deep philosophical, scientific, political, artistic, ecclesiastical, social questions before us, we state ministers, senators, academists, professors, artists, singers, we whose quarter-hours are valued so highly by men, should spend our time in doing — what? Cleaning our boots, washing our shirts, digging, planting potatoes, or feeding our chickens and cows, and so on, — in such business which not only our house-porter, our cook, but thousands of men besides who value our time, would be very glad to do for us.

But why do we dress, wash, and comb our hair ourselves? Why do we walk, hand chairs to ladies, to our guests, open and shut the door, help people into carriages, and perform hundreds of such actions which were formerly performed for us by our slaves?

Because we consider that such may be done by ourselves; that it is compatible with human dignity, that is, human duty. The same holds good with physical labor. Man's dignity, his sacred duty, is to use his hands, his feet, for that purpose for which they were given him, and not to be wasted by disuse, not that he may wash and clean them and use them only for the purpose of stuffing food and cigarettes into his mouth.

Such is the meaning of physical labor for every man in every society. But in our class, with the divergence from this law of nature came the misery of a whole circle of men; and for us, physical labor receives another meaning, — the meaning of a preaching and a propaganda which divert the terrible evil which threatens mankind.

To say that for an educated man physical labor is a useless occupation, is the same as to say, in the building of a temple, What importance can there be in putting each stone exactly in its place? Every great act is done under the conditions of imperceptibility, modesty, and simplicity. One can neither plow, nor feed cattle, nor think, during a great illumination, or thundering of guns, or while in uniform.

Illumination, the roar of cannon, music, uniforms,

cleanliness, brilliancy, which we usually connect with the idea of the importance of any act, are, on the contrary, tokens of the absence of importance in the same. Great, true deeds are always simple and modest. And such is also the greatest deed which is left to us to do, — the solution of those awful contradictions in which we are living. And the acts which solve those contradictions are those modest, imperceptible, seemingly ridiculous acts, such as helping ourselves by physical labor, and, if possible, helping others too: this is what we rich people have to do, if we understand the misery, wrong, and danger of the position in which we are living.

What will come out of the circumstance that I, and another, and a third, and a tenth man, do not despise physical labor, but consider it necessary for our happiness, for the calming of our consciences, and for our safety? This will come of it, — that one, two, three, ten men, coming into conflict with no one, without the violence either of the government or of revolution, will solve for themselves the problem which is before all the world, and which has appeared insolvable; and they will solve it in such a way that life will become for them a good thing: their consciences will be calm, and the evil which oppresses them will cease to be dreadful to them.

Another effect will be this: that other men, too, will see that the welfare, which they have been looking for everywhere, is quite close by them, that seemingly insolvable contradictions of conscience and the order of the world are solved in the easiest and pleasantest way, and that, instead of being afraid of men surrounding them, they must have intercourse with them, and love them.

The seemingly insolvable economical and social questions are like the problem of Krilof's casket. The casket opened of itself, without any difficulty: but it will not open until men do the very simplest and most natural thing, — that is, open it. The seemingly insolvable question is the old question of utilizing some men's labor by

others: this question in our time has found its expression in property.

Formerly, other men's labor was used simply by violence, by slavery: in our time, it is being done by the means of property. In our time, property is the root of all evil and of the sufferings of men who possess it, or are without it, and of all the remorse of conscience of those who misuse it, and of the danger from the collision between those who have it and those who have it not.

Property is the root of all evil; and, at the same time, property is that toward which all the activity of our modern society is directed, and that which directs the activity of the world. States and governments intrigue, make wars, for the sake of property, for the possession of the banks of the Rhine, of land in Africa, China, the Balkan Peninsula. Bankers, merchants, manufacturers, landowners, labor, use cunning, torment themselves, torment others, for the sake of property; government functionaries, tradesmen, landlords, struggle, deceive, oppress, suffer, for the sake of property; courts of justice and police protect property; penal servitude, prisons, all the terrors of so-called punishments, — all is done for the sake of property.

Property is the root of all evil; and now all the world is busy with the distribution and protecting of wealth.

What, then, is property? Men are accustomed to think that property is something really belonging to man, and for this reason they have called it property. We speak indiscriminately of our own house and our own land. But this is obviously an error and a superstition. We know, and if we do not it is easy to perceive, that property is only the means of utilizing other men's labor. And another's labor can by no means belong to me.

Man has been always calling his own that which is subject to his own will and joined with his own consciousness. As soon as man calls his own something which is not his body, but which he should like to be subject to his will as his body is, then he makes a mis-

take, and gets disappointment, suffering, and compels other people to suffer as well. Man calls his wife his own, — his children, his slaves, his belongings, his own too; but the reality always shows him his error, and he must either get rid of this superstition, or suffer and make others suffer.

Now we, having nominally renounced the possessing of slaves, owing to money (and to its exactment by the government), claim our right also to money; that is, to the labor of other men.

But as to our claiming our wives as our property, or our sons, our slaves, our horses, — this is pure fiction contradicted by reality, and which only makes those suffer who believe in it; because a wife or a son will never be so subject to my will as my body is; therefore my own body will always remain the only thing I can call my true property; so also money, — property will never be real property, but only a deception and a source of suffering, and it is only my own body which will be my property, that which always obeys me, and is connected with my consciousness.

It is only to us, who are so accustomed to call other things than our body our own, that such a wild superstition may appear useful for us, and be without evil results; but we have only to reflect upon the nature of the matter in order to see how this, like every other superstition, brings with it only dreadful consequences.

Let us take the most simple example. I consider myself my own, and another man like myself I consider my own, too. I must understand how to cook my dinner: if I were free from the superstition of considering another man as my property, I should have been taught this art as well as every other necessary to my real property (that is, my body); but now I have it taught to my imaginary property, and the result is that my cook does not obey me, does not wish to humor me, and even runs away from me, or dies, and I remain with an unsatisfied want, and have lost the habit of learning, and recognize that I have spent as much time

in cares about this cook as I should have spent in learning the art of cooking myself.

The same is the case with the property of buildings, clothes, wares; with the property of the land; with the property of money. Every imaginary property calls forth in me a non-corresponding want which cannot always be gratified, and deprives me of the possibility of acquiring for my true and sure property — my own body — that information, that skill, those habits, improvements, which I might have acquired.

The result is always that I have spent (without gain to myself, — to my true property) strength, sometimes my whole life, on that which never has been and never could be my property.

I provide myself with an imaginary "private" library, a "private" picture-gallery, "private" apartments, clothes; acquire my "own" money in order to purchase with it everything I want, and the matter stands thus, — that I, being busy about this imaginary property, as if it were real, leave quite out of sight that which is my true property, upon which I may really labor, and which really may serve me, and which always remains in my power.

Words have always a definite meaning until we purposely give them a false signification.

What does property mean?

Property means that which is given to me alone, which belongs to me alone, exclusively; that with which I may always do everything I like, which nobody can take away from me, which remains mine to the end of my life, and that I ought to use in order to increase and to improve it. Such property for every man is only himself.

And it is in this very sense that imaginary property is understood, that very property for the sake of which (in order to make it impossible for this imaginary property to become a real one) all the sufferings of this world exist, — wars, executions, judgments, prisons, luxury, depravity, murders, and the ruin of mankind.

What, then, will come out of the circumstance that

ten men plow, hew wood, make boots, not from want, but from the acknowledgment that man needs work, and that the more he works, the better it will be for him?

This will come out of it: that ten men, or even one single man, in thought and in deed, will show men that this fearful evil from which they are suffering is not the law of their destiny, nor the will of God, nor any historical necessity, but a superstition; not at all a strong or overpowering one, but weak and null, in which it is only necessary to leave off believing, as in idols, in order to get rid of it, and to destroy it as a frail cobweb is swept away.

Men who begin to work in order to fulfil the pleasant law of their lives, who work for the fulfilment of the law of labor, will free themselves from the superstition of property which is so full of misery, and then all these worldly establishments which exist in order to protect this imaginary property outside of one's own body will become not only unnecessary for them but burdensome; and it will become plain to all that these institutions are not necessary, but pernicious, imaginary, and false conditions of life.

For a man who considers labor not a curse, but a joy, property outside his own body — that is, the right or possibility of utilizing other men's labor — will be not only useless, but an impediment. If I am fond of cooking my dinner, and accustomed to do it, then the fact that another man will do it for me will deprive me of my usual business, and will not satisfy me as well as I have satisfied myself; besides, the acquirement of an imaginary property will not be necessary for such a man: a man who considers labor to be his very life fills up with it all his life and therefore requires less and less the labor of others — in other words, property in order to fill up his unoccupied time and to embellish his life.

If the life of a man is occupied by labor, he does not require many rooms, much furniture, various fine clothes; he does not require expensive food, carriages, amusements. But particularly a man who considers labor to be the business and the joy of his life will

not seek to ease his own labor by utilizing that of others.

A man who considers life to consist in labor, in proportion as he acquires more skill, craft, and endurance, will aim at having more and more work to do, which should occupy all his time. For such a man, who sees the object of his life in labor, and not in the results of this labor for the acquirement of property, there cannot be even a question about the instruments of labor. Though such a man will always choose the most productive instrument of labor, he will have the same satisfaction in working with the most unproductive.

If he has a steam-plow, he will plow with it; if he has not such, he will plow with a horse-plow; if he has not this, he will plow with the plain Russian sokha; if he has not even this, he will use a spade: and under any circumstances, he will attain his aim; that is, will pass his life in a labor useful to man, and therefore he will have fullest satisfaction; and the position of such a man, according to exterior and interior circumstances, will be happier than the condition of a man who gives his life away to acquire property.

According to exterior circumstances, he will never want, because men, seeing that he does not mind work, will always try to make his labor most productive to them, as they arrange a mill by running water; and in order that his labor may be more productive, they will provide for his material existence, which they will never do for men who aim at acquiring property.

And the providing for material wants is all that a man requires. According to interior conditions, such a man will be always happier than he who seeks for property, because the latter will never receive what he is aiming at, and the former always in proportion to his strength: even the weak, old, dying (according to the proverb, with a Kored in his hands), will receive full satisfaction, and the love and sympathy of men.

One of the consequences of this will be that some odd, half-insane persons will plow, make boots, and so on, instead of smoking, playing cards, and riding about,

carrying with them, from one place to another, their dullness during the ten hours which every man of letters has at his command.

Another result will be that those silly people will demonstrate, in deed, that that imaginary property for the sake of which men suffer, torment themselves and others, is not necessary for happiness, and even impedes it, and is only a superstition; and that true property is only one's own head, hands, feet; and that in order to utilize this true property usefully and joyfully, it is necessary to get rid of the false idea of property outside one's own body, on which we waste the best powers of our life.

Another result will be that these men will show that, when a man leaves off believing in imaginary property, then only will he make real use of his true property, — his own body, which will yield him fruit an hundred-fold, and such happiness of which we have no idea as yet; and he will be a useful, strong, kind man, who will everywhere stand on his own feet, will always be a brother to everybody, will be intelligible to all, desired by all, and dear to all.

And men, looking at one, at ten, such silly men will understand what they have all to do in order to undo that dreadful knot in which they have all been tied by the superstition respecting property, in order to get rid of the miserable condition from which they are groaning now, and from which they do not know how to free themselves.

But what can a man do in a crowd who do not agree with him? There is no reasoning which could more obviously demonstrate the unrighteousness of those who employ it as does this. The boatmen are dragging vessels against the stream. Is it possible that there could be found such a stupid boatman who would refuse to do his part in dragging because he alone cannot drag the boat up against the stream? He who, besides his rights of animal life, — to eat and to sleep, — acknowledges any human duty, knows very well wherein such duty consists: just in the same way as a boatman knows

that he has only to get into his breast-collar, and to walk in the given direction, to find out what he has to do and how to do it.

And so with the boatmen, and with all men who do any labor in common, so with the labor of all mankind; each man need only keep on his breast-collar, and go in the given direction. And for this purpose one and the same reason is given to all men, that this direction may always be the same.

And that this direction *is* given to us is obvious and certain from the lives of those who surround us, as well as in the conscience of every man, and in all the previous expressions of human wisdom; so that only he who does not want work may say that he does not see it.

What will, then, come out of this?

This: that first one man, then another, will drag; looking at them, a third will join; and so one by one the best men will join, until the business will be set a-going, and will move as of itself, inducing those also to join who do not yet understand why and wherefore it is being done.

First, to the number of men who conscientiously work in order to fulfil the law of God, will be added those who will accept half conscientiously and half upon faith; then to these a still greater number of men, only upon the faith in the foremost men; and lastly the majority of people: and then it will come to pass that men will cease to ruin themselves, and will find out happiness.

This will happen soon when men of our circle, and after them all the great majority of working-people, will no longer consider it shameful to clean sewers, but will consider it shameful to fill them up in order that other men, *our brethren*, may carry their contents away; they will not consider it shameful to go visiting in common boots, but they will consider it shameful to walk in goloshes by barefooted people; they will not think it shameful not to know French, or about the last novel, but they will consider it shameful to eat bread, and not to know how it is prepared; they will not consider it shameful not to have a starched shirt or a clean dress,

but that it is shameful to wear a clean coat as a token of one's idleness; they will not consider it shameful to have dirty hands, but not to have callouses on their hands.

Within my memory, still more striking changes have taken place. I remember that at table, behind each chair, a servant stood with a plate. Men made visits accompanied by two footmen. A Cossack boy and a girl stood in a room to give people their pipes, and to clean them, and so on. Now this seems to us strange and remarkable. But is it not equally strange that a young man or woman, or even an elderly man, in order to visit a friend, should order his horses to be harnessed, and that well-fed horses are only kept for this purpose? Is it not as strange that one man lives in five rooms, or that a woman spends tens, hundreds, thousands of rubles for her dress when she only needs some flax and wool in order to spin dresses for herself and clothes for her husband and children?

Is it not strange that men live doing nothing, riding to and fro, smoking and playing, and that a battalion of people are busy feeding and warming them?

Is it not strange that old people quite gravely talk and write in newspapers about theaters, music, and other insane people drive to look at musicians or actors?

Is it not strange that tens of thousands of boys and girls are brought up so as to make them unfit for every work (they return home from school, and their two books are carried for them by a servant)?

There will soon come a time, and it is already drawing near, when it will be shameful to dine on five courses served by footmen, and cooked by any but the masters themselves; it will be shameful not only to ride thoroughbreds or in a coach when one has feet to walk on; to wear on week-days such dress, shoes, gloves, in which it is impossible to work; it will be shameful to play on a piano which costs one hundred and fifty pounds, or even ten pounds, while others work for one; to feed dogs upon milk and white bread, and to burn lamps and candles without working by their light; to heat stoves

in which the meal is not cooked. Then it would be impossible to think about giving openly not merely one pound, but six pence, for a place in a concert or in a theater. All this will be when the law of labor becomes public opinion.

CHAPTER XL

As it is said in the Bible, there is a law given unto man and woman, — to man, the law of labor; to woman, the law of child-bearing. Although with our science, "*nous avons changé tout ça*," the law of man as well as of woman remains as immutable as the liver in its place; and the breach of it is as inevitably punished by death. The only difference is that, for man, the breach of law is punished by death in such a near future that it can almost be called present; but for woman, the breach of law is punished in a more distant future.

A general breach, by all men, of the law, destroys men immediately; the breach by women destroys the men of the following generation. The evasion of the law by a few men and women does not destroy the human race, but deprives the offender of rational human nature.

The breach of this law by men began years ago in the classes which could use violence with others; and, spreading on its way, it has reached our day, and has now attained madness, the ideal contained in a breach of the law, the ideal expressed by Prince Blokhin, and shared by Renan and the whole educated world; work will be done by machines, and men will be bundles of nerves enjoying themselves.

There has been scarcely any breach of the law by women. It has only manifested itself in prostitution, and in private cases of crime in destroying progeny. Women of the wealthy classes have fulfilled their law, while men did not fulfil theirs; and therefore women have grown stronger, and have continued to govern, and will govern, men, who have deviated from their law,

and who, consequently, have lost their reason. It is generally said that women (the women of Paris, especially those who are childless) have become so bewitching, using all the means of civilization, that they have mastered man by their charms.

This is not only wrong, but it is just the reverse of the truth. It is not the childless woman who has mastered man, but it is the mother, the one who has fulfilled her duty, while man has not fulfilled his.

As to the woman who artificially remains childless, and bewitches man by her shoulders and curls, she is not a woman, mastering man, but a woman corrupted by him, reduced to his level, to the corrupted man, and who, as well as he, has deviated from her duty, and who, as well as he, has lost every reasonable sense of life.

This mistake produces also the astounding nonsense which is called "woman's rights." The formula of these rights is as follows: —

"You men," says woman, "have deviated from your law of true labor, and want us to carry the load of ours. No: if so, we also, as well as you, will make a pretense of labor, as you do in banks, ministries, universities, and academies; we wish, as well as you, by the pretense of division of work, to profit by other people's work, and to live only to satisfy our lust." They say so, and in deed show that they can make that pretense of labor, not at all worse, but even better, than men do it.

The so-called question of woman's rights arose, and only could arise, among men who had deviated from the law of real labor. One has only to return to it, and that question must cease to exist. A woman who has her own particular, inevitable labor will never claim the right of sharing man's labor, — in mines, or in plowing fields. She claims a share only in the sham labor of the wealthy classes.

The woman of our class was stronger than man, and is now still stronger, not through her charms, not through her skill in performing the same pharisaic

similitude of work as man, but because she has not stepped outside of the law; because she has borne that true labor with danger of life, with uttermost effort; true labor, from which the man of the wealthy classes has freed himself.

But within my memory has begun also the deviation from the law by woman, — that is to say, her fall; and within my memory, it has proceeded farther and farther. A woman who has lost the law believes that her power consists in the charms of her witchery, or in her skill at a pharisaic pretense of intellectual labor. But children hinder the one and the other. Therefore, with the help of science, within my memory it has come to pass that among the wealthy classes, scores of means of destroying progeny have appeared. And behold, — women, mothers, some of them of the wealthy classes, who held their power in their hands, let it slip away, only to place themselves on a level with women of the street. The evil has spread far, and spreads farther every day, and will soon grasp all the women of the wealthy classes; and then they will become even with men, and together with them will lose every reasonable sense of life. But there is yet time.

If only women would understand their worth, their power, and would use them for the work of salvation of their husbands, brothers, and children! the salvation of all men!

Women, mothers of the wealthy classes, the salvation of men of our world from the evils from which it suffers, is in your hands!

Not those women who are occupied by their figures, bustles, head-dresses, and their charms for men, and who, contrary to their will, by oversight and with despair, bear children, and then give their children to wet-nurses; nor yet those who go to different lectures, and talk of psychometrical centers and differentiation, and who also try to free themselves from bearing children in order not to hinder their folly, which they call development, — but those women and mothers who, having the power of freeing themselves from child-bearing, hold strictly and con-

sciously to that eternal, immutable law, knowing that the weight and labor of that submission is the aim of their life. These women and mothers of our wealthy classes are those in whose hands, more than in any others, lies the salvation of the men of our sphere in life, from the calamities which oppress them.

You women and mothers who submit consciously to the law of God, you are the only ones who, in our miserable, mutilated world, which has lost all semblance of humanity, you are the only ones who know the whole true meaning of life according to the law of God; and you are the only ones who, by your example, can show men the happiness of that submission to God's law, of which they rob themselves.

You are the only ones who know the joy and happiness which takes possession of one's whole being; the bliss which is the share of every man who does not deviate from God's law. You know the joy of love to your husband, — a joy never ending, never destroyed, like all other joys, but forming the beginning of another new joy, — love to your child. You are the only ones, when you are simple and submissive to God's law, who know, not the farcical pretense of labor, which men of your world call labor, but that true labor which is imposed by God upon men, and know the rewards for it, — the bliss which it gives.

You know it when, after the joys of love, you expect, with emotion, fear, and hope, the torturing state of pregnancy, which makes you ill for nine months, and brings you to the brink of death and to unbearable sufferings and pains; you know the conditions of true labor, when with joy you expect the approach and increase of the most dreadful sufferings, after which comes the bliss, known to you only.

You know it when, directly after those sufferings, without rest, without interruption, you undertake another series of labors and sufferings, — those of nursing; for the sake of which you subjugate to your feeling, and renounce, the strongest human necessity, — that of sleep, which, according to the saying, is sweeter than father

and mother. And for months and years you do not sleep two nights running, and often you do not sleep whole nights; walking alone to and fro, rocking in your wearied arms an ailing baby, whose sufferings tear your heart. And when you do all this, unapproved and unseen by anybody, not expecting any praise or reward for it; when you do this, not as a great deed, but as the laborer of the gospel parable, who came from the field, considering that you are only doing your duty, — you know then what is false, fictitious labor, — for human fame; and what is true labor, — the fulfilment of God's will, the indication of which you feel in your heart. You know, if you are a true mother, that not only nobody has seen and praised your labor, considering that it is only what ought to be, but even those for whom you toiled are not only ungrateful to you, but often torment and reproach you. And with the next child you do the same, — again you suffer, again you bear unseen, terrible toil, and again you do not expect any reward from anybody, and feel the same satisfaction.

If you are such, you will not say, after two or after twenty children, that you have borne children enough; as a fifty-year-old workman will not say that he has worked enough, when he still eats and sleeps, and his muscles demand work. If you are such, you will not cast the trouble of nursing and care on a strange mother, any more than a workman will give the work which he has begun, and nearly finished, to another man, because in that work you put your life, and because, the more you have of that work, the fuller and happier is your life.

But when you are like this, — and there are yet such women, happily for men, — the same law of fulfilment of God's will, by which you guide your own life, you will apply also to the life of your husband, of your children, and of men near to you. If you are such, and if you know by experience that only self-denied, unseen, unrewarded labor with danger of life, and uttermost effort for the life of others, is that mission of man which gives satisfaction, you will claim the same from others, you

will encourage your husband to do the same labor, you will value and appreciate the worth of men by this same labor, and for it you will prepare your children.

Only that mother who looks on child-bearing as a disagreeable accident, and upon the pleasures of love, comfort, education, sociability, as the sense of life, will bring up her children so that they shall have as many pleasures, and enjoy them as much as possible; will feed them luxuriously, dress them smartly, will artificially divert them, and will teach them, not that which will make them capable of self-sacrificing man's and woman's labor with danger of life and uttermost effort, but that which will deliver them from that labor. Only such a woman, who has lost the sense of her life, will sympathize with that false, sham man's labor, by means of which her husband, freeing himself from man's duty, has the possibility of profiting, together with her, by the labor of others. Only such a woman will choose a similar husband for her daughter, and value men, not by what they are in themselves, but by what is attached to them,—position, money, the art of profiting by the labor of others.

A true mother, who really knows God's law, will prepare her children for the fulfilment of it. For such a mother to see her child overfed, delicate, overdressed, will be a suffering, because all this she knows will hinder it in the fulfilment of God's law experienced by herself. Such a woman will not teach that which will give her son or daughter the possibility of delivering themselves from labor, but that which will help them to bear the labor of life.

She will not want to ask what to teach her children, or for what to prepare them, knowing what it is and in what consists the mission of men, and consequently knowing what to teach her children, and for what to prepare them. Such a woman will not only discourage her husband from false, sham labor, the only aim of which is to profit by other people's work, but will view with disgust and dread an activity that will serve as a double temptation for her children. Such a woman will

not choose her daughter's husband according to the whiteness of his hands, and the refinement of his manners, but, knowing thoroughly what is labor and what deceit, will always and everywhere, beginning with her husband, respect and appreciate men, will claim from them true labor with waste and danger of life, and will scorn that false, sham labor which has for its aim the delivering-of one's self from true labor.

Such a mother *will bring forth and nurse her children herself*, and, above all things else, will feed and provide for them, will work for them, wash and teach them, will sleep and talk with them, because she makes that her life-work. Only such a mother will not seek for her children external security through her husband's money, or her children's diplomas, but she will exercise in them the same capacity of self-sacrificing fulfilment of God's will which she knows in herself, the capacity for bearing labor with waste and danger of life, because she knows that only in that lie the security and welfare of life. Such a mother will not have to ask others what is her duty: she will know everything beforehand, and will fear nothing.

If there can be doubts for a man or for a childless woman about the way to fulfil God's will, for a mother that way is firmly and clearly drawn; and if she fulfils it humbly, with a simple heart, standing on the highest point of good, which it is only given to a human being to attain, she becomes the guiding-star for all men, tending to the same good. Only a mother before her death can say to Him who sent her into this world, and to Him whom she has served by bearing and bringing up children, beloved by her more than herself,—only she can peacefully say, after having served Him in her appointed service:—

“ ‘Now lettest Thou thy servant depart in peace.’ ”

And this is that highest perfection, to which, as to the highest good, men aspire.

Such women, who fulfil their mission, are those who reign over reigning men; those who prepare new generations of men, and form public opinion: and there-

fore in the hands of these women lies the highest power of men's salvation from the existing and threatening evils of our time.

Yes, women, mothers, in your hands, more than in those of any others, lies the salvation of the world!

NOTE TO CHAPTER XL

THE vocation of every man and woman is to serve other people. With this general proposition, I think all who are not immoral people will agree. The difference between men and women in the fulfilment of that vocation, is only in the means by which they attain it; that is to say, by which they serve men.

Man serves others by physical work, — procuring food; by intellectual work, — studying the laws of nature in order to master it; and by social work, — instituting forms of life, and establishing mutual relations between people.

The means of serving others are various for men. The whole activity of mankind, with the exception of bearing children and rearing them, is open for his service to men. A woman, in addition to the possibility of serving men by all the means open to man, by the construction of her body is called, and is inevitably attracted, to serve others by that which alone is excepted from the domain of the service of man.

The service of mankind is divided into two parts, — one, the augmentation of the welfare of mankind; the other, the continuation of the race. Men are called chiefly to the first, as they are deprived of the possibility of fulfilling the second. Women are called exclusively to the second, as they only are fitted for it. This difference one should not, one cannot, forget or destroy; and it would be sinful to do so. From this difference proceed the duties of each, — duties not invented by men, but which are in the nature of things. From the same difference proceeds the estimation of virtue and vice for woman and man, — the estimation which has existed in every century, which exists now, and which will never cease to exist while in men reason exists.

It always has been, and it always will be, the case that a man who spends a great part of his life in the various physical and mental labors which are natural to him, and a woman who spends a great part of her life in the labor of bearing, nursing, and rearing children, which is her exclusive prerogative, will equally feel that they are doing their duty, and will equally rise in the esteem and love of other people, because they both fulfil that which is appointed to them by their nature.

The vocation of man is broader and more varied, the vocation of woman more uniform and narrower, but more profound; and therefore it has always been, and always will be, the case that man, hav-

ing hundreds of duties, will be neither a bad nor a pernicious man, even when he has been false to one or ten out of them, if he fulfils the greater part of his vocation; while woman, as she has a smaller number of duties, if she is false to one of them, instantly falls lower than a man who has been false to ten out of his hundreds of duties. Such has always been the general opinion, and such it will always remain,—because such is the substance of the matter.

A man, in order to fulfil God's will, must serve Him in the domain of physical work, thought, and morality: in all these ways he can fulfil his vocation. Woman's service to God consists chiefly and almost exclusively in bearing children (because no one except herself can render it). Only by means of work is man called to serve God and his fellow-men: only by means of her children is a woman called to serve them.

And therefore, love to her own children which is inborn in woman, that exclusive love against which it is quite vain to strive by reasoning, will always be, and ought to be, natural to a woman and a mother. That love to a child in its infancy is not egotism, but it is the love of a workman for the work which he is doing while it is in his hands. Take away that love for the object of one's work and the work becomes impossible. While I am making a boot, I love it above everything. If I did not love it, I could not work at it. If anybody spoils it for me, I am in despair; but I only love it thus while I am working at it. When it is completed, there remains an attachment, a preference, which is weak and illegitimate.

It is the same with a mother. A man is called to serve others by multifarious labors, and he loves those labors while he is accomplishing them. A woman is called to serve others by her children, and she cannot help loving those children of hers while she is rearing them to the age of three, seven, or ten years.

In the general vocation of serving God and others, man and woman are entirely equal, notwithstanding the difference of the form of that service. The equality consists in the equal importance of one service and of the other,—that the one is impossible without the other, that the one depends upon the other, and that for efficient service, as well for man as for woman, the knowledge of truth is equally necessary.

Without this knowledge, the activity of man and woman becomes, not useful, but pernicious for mankind. Man is called to fulfil his multifarious labor; but his labor is only useful, and his physical, mental, and social labor is only fruitful, when it is fulfilled in the name of truth and the welfare of others.

A man can occupy himself as zealously as he will to increase his pleasures by vain reasoning and with social activity for his own advantage: his labor will not be fruitful. It will only be so when it is directed toward lessening the suffering of others from want and ignorance, and from false social organization.

The same with woman's vocation: her bearing, nursing, and bringing up children will only be useful to mankind when she not only gives

birth to children for her own pleasure, but when she prepares future servants of mankind; when the education of those children is done in the name of truth and for the welfare of others, — that is to say, when she will educate her children in such a manner that they shall be the very best men possible, and the very best laborers for others.

The ideal woman, in my opinion, is the one who, appropriating the highest view of life of the time in which she lives, yet gives herself to her feminine mission, which is irresistibly placed in her, — that of bringing forth, nursing, and educating the greatest possible number of children, fitted to work for people according to the view which she has of life.

But in order to appropriate the highest view of life, I think there is no need of visiting lectures: all that she requires is to read the Gospel, and not to shut her eyes, ears, and, most of all, her heart.

Well, and if you ask what those are to do who have no children, who are not married, or are widows, I answer that those will do well to share man's multifarious labor. But one cannot help being sorry that such a precious tool as woman is, should be bereft of the possibility of fulfilling the great vocation which it is proper to her alone to fulfil.

Especially as every woman, when she has finished bearing children, if she has strength left, will have the time to occupy herself with that help in man's labor. Woman's help in that labor is very precious; but it will always be a pity to see a young woman fit for child-bearing, and occupied by man's labor.

To see such a woman is the same as to see precious vegetable soil covered with stones for a place of parade or for a walking-ground. Still more a pity, because this earth could only produce bread, and a woman could produce that for which there cannot be any equivalent, higher than which there is nothing — man. And only she is able to do this.



COUNT I. N. TOLSTOÏ.

From the portrait by Kramsky, 1876.

LIFE

"Man is only a reed, the feeblest in nature ; but he is a thinking reed. It is not necessary that the whole universe should rise in arms to crush him. A vapor, a drop of water, suffices to kill him. But if the entire universe were to crush him, man would still be more noble than that which slays him, because he knows that he is dying ; and of the advantage which the universe possesses over him the universe knows nothing. Thus all our dignity consists in thought. It is that upon which we must take our stand, not upon space and duration. Let us, then, labor to think well ; that is the principle of morals." — PASCAL.

"Two things fill my spirit with ever fresh and increasing wonder and awe, the oftener and the more steadfastly my thoughts occupy themselves therewith, — the starry heavens above me and the moral law within me. . . . The first begins from the place which I occupy in the outer world of sense, and extends the connection in which I stand to invisible space beyond the eye of man, with worlds on worlds, systems on systems, to their periodical movements in endless time, their beginning and continuance. The second begins with my unseen self, my personality, and places me in a world which has true eternity, but which is perceptible only to the understanding, and with which I am conscious of being, not, as in the former case, accidental, but in universal and indispensable connection." — KANT ("Critique of Pure Reason," Conclusion).

"A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another."
— GOSPEL OF JOHN, xiii. 34.

INTRODUCTION

LET us picture to ourselves a man whose only means of livelihood is a mill. This man is the son and grandson of a miller, and knows thoroughly, by tradition, how to deal with every part of the mill so that it shall grind well. This man, though ignorant of mechanics, adjusts all the parts of the mill to the best of his ability, so that the product may be profitable and good, and that men may live and eat.

But it has chanced that this man has begun to reflect upon the construction of the mill, to hear some confused statements about its mechanism, and he has begun to observe what part is turned by what other part.

And, from the fly-wheel to the grindstone, from the grindstone to the mill-race, from the mill-race to the wheel, from the wheel to the gate, the dam, and the water, he has come clearly to comprehend that the whole matter lies in the dam and the river. And the man has rejoiced so greatly in this discovery of his, that instead of scrutinizing, as heretofore, the quality of the flour which comes forth, instead of raising and lowering the millstones, of shoeing them, of tightening and slackening the belt, he has begun to study the river. And his mill has been thrown entirely out of gear. People have begun to tell the miller that he is not behaving rightly. He has disputed, and continued to reason about the river. And he has worked so much, so very much, over this, he has disputed so much and so hotly with those who have proved to him the falsity of his premises, that he has, at last, become convinced that the river is the mill itself.

To every proof of the falsity of his course of reasoning such a miller will reply: "No mill grinds without water. Consequently, in order to know the mill, it is

requisite to know how to admit the water, to know the force of its current and whence it is derived ; hence, in order to know the mill, it is necessary to know the river."

The miller cannot be logically controverted in his line of argument. The only means of dispelling his illusion lies in showing him that, in every course of reasoning, the reasoning itself is not so important as the place occupied by the reasoning, *i.e.* that, in order to meditate fruitfully, it is indispensable to know upon what to meditate first, and what afterward ; to demonstrate to him that sensible activity is distinguished from senseless activity only in this, — that sensible activity disposes its meditations in the order of their importance, deciding which reasoning must come first, second, third, tenth, and so on. But senseless activity consists in reasoning without order. It must be demonstrated to him that the order of this arrangement is not accidental, but that it depends upon the object for which the reasoning is conducted.

The object of all courses of reasoning determines the order in which the separate trains of thought must be arranged in order to be understood.

And reasoning not bound together by a common aim of all the arguments is foolish, no matter how logical it may be.

The aim of the miller consists in producing good flour, and this aim, if he will keep it in view, will determine for him the most unquestionable regularity and order of sequence for his reasoning about the millstones, the wheel, the dam, and the river.

But without this relation to the aim of his reasoning, the miller's arguments, no matter how fine and logical they may be, will be inherently irregular and, what is the principal consideration, vain ; they will be like the reasoning of Kifa Mokeevitch,¹ when he argued as to what should be the thickness of the shell of an elephant's egg, if elephants were produced from the egg, like birds.

¹ An incoherent reasoner, introduced in Part Second of Gogol's "Dead Souls." — TRANS.

And such in my opinion are the arguments of our contemporary science about life.

Life is the mill which man desires to investigate. The mill is necessary to grind well; life is necessary only in order that it may be good. And this branch of investigation man cannot abandon for a single moment with impunity. If he does abandon it, his deliberations infallibly lose their place, and become like the reasoning of Mokeevitch as to how much powder would be required to break the shell of elephants' eggs.

Man studies life only in order that it may become better. In this manner have those men studied life who have advanced humanity in the path of knowledge. But, by the side of these true teachers and benefactors of humanity, there always have existed, and there exist now, reasoners who have abandoned the aim of reasoning, and who, in its stead, investigate the question as to the origin of life, — as to why the mill turns. Some assert that it is by reason of the water; others, that it is in consequence of the arrangement. The dispute waxes hot, and the subject of discussion moves farther and farther away, and is completely replaced by utterly foreign topics.

There is an ancient jest regarding the dispute of a Jew and a Christian. The story runs that the Christian, replying to the confused subtleties of the Jew, slapped the latter on his bald pate with his palm, so that it cracked, and put the question: "Did the crack come from the pate or the palm?" And the dispute about faith was replaced by a fresh and insoluble problem.

Something of the same sort has been in progress since the most ancient times, side by side with men's true wisdom, and in connection with the question about life.

Discussions are known to have arisen in the most ancient times as to the origin of life? whether from an immaterial beginning, or from the combination of various materials? And these discussions have continued down to the present day, so that no end to them can be foreseen, because the aim of all discussion has been

abandoned, and life is reasoned upon apart from its aim, and by the word life — life itself is not understood, but that from which it proceeds, or that which accompanies it.

Now, not only in scientific books, but even in conversation, when life is mentioned, the discussion is not about what we all know, — about life; about life of which I am conscious by those sufferings which I fear and which I hate, and by those joys and pleasures which I desire; but of something which came into existence, perhaps, through the play of chance according to some physical laws, and, perhaps, because it possesses in itself some secret cause.

Now the word "life" is ascribed to something contestable, which does not contain within itself the chief signs of life: the consciousness of suffering and of enjoyment, and of aspirations toward goodness.

"*La vie est l'ensemble des fonctions, qui resiste à la mort. La vie est l'ensemble des phénomènes, qui se succèdent pendant un temps limité dans un être organisé.*" Life is the sum total of the functions which resist death. Life is the sum total of the phenomena which follow each other in the course of a limited time in an organic being.

Setting aside the inaccuracy, the tautology, with which these definitions are filled, the substance of them all is identical, namely, — that which all men in common understand incontestably by the word "life" is not defined by them, but some processes or other which are accompanied by life and other phenomena.

Under the majority of these definitions comes the activity of the crystal in process of formation; under some comes the activity of fermentation, decomposition; and under all comes the life of each separate cell in my body, for which there nothing exists — neither good nor evil. Some of the processes that take place in the crystal, in the protoplasm, in the germ of the protoplasm, in the cells of my body and of other bodies, are called by a word which is indissolubly connected in me with the consciousness of an aspiration toward my welfare.

Arguments upon some of the conditions of life, as life itself, are precisely the same as the argument about the river, as about the mill. These arguments are, possibly, very necessary for some purpose or other. But they do not touch the subject which they intend to discuss. And, therefore, all deductions as to life drawn from such arguments cannot fail to be false.

The word "life" is very short and very clear, and every one understands what it signifies, and we are bound always to employ it in that sense which is comprehensible to every one. Surely this word is comprehensible to every one, not because it is very accurately defined by other words and ideas, but, on the contrary, because this word expresses a fundamental conception, from which are deduced many, if not all, other conceptions, and therefore, in order to draw deductions from this conception, we are bound, first of all, to accept that conception in its central signification which is undisputed by every one. And precisely this, it seems to me, has been neglected by the contending parties in connection with the conception of life. It has come to pass that the fundamental conception of life, taken at first, not in its central significance, in consequence of disputes about it, and departing ever more and more from its fundamental meaning, accepted by every one, has finally lost the thought upon which it is based, and has received another meaning, which does not correspond to it. This has come to pass, that the very center from which the figure was drawn has been deserted and transferred to another point. Men dispute over the question, whether life lies in the cell or in the protoplasm, or, still lower, in inorganic matter.

But, before disputing, we should ask ourselves, have we a right to attribute the conception of life to a cell?

We say, for instance, that there is life in the cell, that the cell is the living being. But the fundamental conception of human life and the conception of life which is contained in the cell are two conceptions which are not only utterly different, but which cannot be united. One conception excludes the other. I discover that the whole

of my body, without exception, consists of cells. These cells, I am informed, possess the same sort of life as myself, and are precisely such living beings as myself; but I acknowledge that I am alive only because I am conscious that I, with all the cells which constitute me, am one living, indivisible being. But I am informed that the whole of me, without exception, is composed of living cells. To whom am I to attribute the property of life, to the cells or to myself? If I admit that the cells have life, then from the idea of life I must obtain the chief indication of my life, the consciousness that I am a single, living being; but if I do not admit that I have life as an independent being, then it is evident that I can by no means attribute that property to the cells of which my body is composed, and of whose consciousness I know nothing.

Either I am alive, and there are portions of me which are not alive, called cells, or there exists an assemblage of living cells, and my consciousness of life is not life, but merely an illusion.

For we do not say that there is in the cells anything that we call *bryzn*, but we say that there is "life" (*Zhizn*). We say "life" because by this word we understand, not some indefinite x , but a thoroughly well-defined dimension, which we all call by the same name, and know only through ourselves as the consciousness of ourselves with our own unit of body, indivisible from ourselves,—and hence such a conception is inapplicable to those cells of which my body is composed.

In whatever investigations or observations a man engages, he is bound, in stating his observations, by every word to mean that which every one indisputably understands alike, and not some conception or other which is necessary to him, but wholly incompatible with its fundamental conception comprehensible to all.

If the word "life" can be used so that it designates, indifferently, both the property of an object as a whole, and entirely different properties of all its component parts, as is done in the case of the cell and the animal composed of cells, then other words may also be em-

ployed in the same way. We may say, for example, that, as all thoughts are composed of words, and all words are composed of letters, and letters are made up of lines, the drawing of lines is the same as the exposition of thoughts, and that, therefore, lines may be called thoughts.

The most ordinary phenomenon in the scientific world is to hear and to read discussions upon the origin of *life* from the play of physical, mechanical powers.

But it is doubtful if the majority of the scientific people hold to this — I find it difficult to express it — opinion which is not an opinion, this paradox which is not a paradox, but rather a jest or a riddle.

It asserts that life proceeds from the play of physical and mechanical forces, of those physical forces which we have named physical and mechanical merely in contradistinction to the conception of life.

It is evident that the word "life," improperly applied to conceptions which are foreign to it, departing farther and farther from its fundamental signification, has abandoned its center to such a degree that life is already assumed to be where, according to our conceptions, life cannot exist. The assumption is equivalent to asserting that there exists a circle or sphere whose center lies outside of its periphery.

In fact, life, which I cannot imagine as otherwise than as a striving from evil toward good, proceeds from those regions where I can discern neither good nor evil. It is evident that the center of the conception of life has been entirely shifted. Moreover, following up the investigations into that something called life, I even see that these investigations touch hardly any of the conceptions with which I am acquainted. I perceive an entire series of new conceptions, and of words which possess their conventional meaning in the scientific jargon, but which have nothing in common with existing conceptions.

The conception of life which is familiar to me is not understood as every one understands it, and the conceptions deduced from it do not accord with the usual conceptions, but present themselves as new, conven-

tional conceptions, having received manufactured names to correspond.

The human language is becoming more and more supplanted in scientific investigations, and instead of language, the means of expression of existing objects and ideas, a scientific volapük reigns, distinguished from the real volapük only in this, that the real volapük calls existing objects and conceptions by universal words, but the scientific volapük calls, by words which do not exist, conceptions which do not exist.

The sole means of mental communication between men is language, and, in order that this communication may be possible, it is necessary so to employ language that every word shall infallibly evoke, in every one, corresponding and accurate conceptions. But if it be possible to use language at random, and by that language to understand whatever occurs to us, it is better not to speak, but to indicate everything by signs.

I admit that to settle the laws of the world from the deductions of the mind alone, without experience or observation, is a false and unscientific course—that is to say, it cannot afford true knowledge; but will it not be still worse to study the phenomena of the world by experiments and observations, and at the same time be guided in these experiments and observations by conceptions which are not fundamental and common to all men, but conventional, and to describe the results of these experiments in words to which a varying significance can be attached? The best apothecary's shop is productive of the greatest injury if the labels are pasted on the bottles not according to their contents, but to suit the convenience of the apothecary.

But men say to me: "Science does not set itself the task of examining all the combinations of life (including within it, will, the desire for good, and the spiritual world); it makes only an abstract from the ideas of life of those phenomena which are subject to its experimental investigations.

This would be very good and lawful. But we know that this is not at all the case in the representations of

the scientific men of our times. If, first of all, the conception of life were admitted in its central significance, in that in which every one understands it, it would afterward be clearly settled that science, having made from this conception an abstraction of all its sides, except of the one subject to external observation, looks upon the phenomena from that side only for which it has its own peculiar methods of investigation, it would all be very well, and it would be quite another thing; then the place which science would have occupied, and the results to which we should have arrived on the foundation of science, would have been entirely different. That which is must be said, and we must not conceal that which we all know. Do we not know that the majority of experimental scientific investigators are fully convinced that they are studying, not one side only of life, but all life?

Astronomy, mechanics, physics, chemistry, and all the other sciences, together and separately, work over the side of life appertaining to each without coming to any results as to life in general. Only during the period of their savagery, that is to say, of their indistinctness, their ill-defined state, did some of these sciences endeavor from their own point of view to grasp all the phenomena of life, and became confused, through inventing for themselves new conceptions and new words. Thus it was with astronomy when it was astrology, thus it was with chemistry when it was alchemy. The same thing now takes place with that experimental science of evolution which, surveying one side or several sides of life, brings forward a claim to the study of all life.

Men with such a false view of science by no means wish to admit that only a few sides of life are subject to their investigation, but they affirm that all life, with all its phenomena, will be studied by them, by the path of external experiment. "If," say they, "*psychics*" (they are fond of this indefinite word of their volapük) "are still unknown to us, they will yet be known to us. By following up one side or several sides of the phenomena of life, we shall learn to know all sides. That is to say, in other words, that, if we gaze very long and earnestly

upon an object from one side, we shall see the object from all sides, and even from its interior."

Amazing as is this strange doctrine, — explicable only by the fanaticism of superstition, — it does exist, and, like every whimsical, fanatical doctrine, it produces its destructive effect, directing the activity of human thought in a false and frivolous path. Conscientious toilers perish, having consecrated their lives to the study of an almost utterly worthless thing. The material forces of people perish from being turned in a direction which is useless. The young generations perish, being directed to the same idle activity as Kifa Mokeevitch, erected into the rank of the highest service to humanity.

It is generally said : Science studies life from all sides. And here lies the point, that every subject has as many sides as there are radii in a sphere, that is to say, they are innumerable, and it is impossible to study from all sides; but one must know from which side it is most important and necessary, and from which it is less important and less useful. As it is impossible to approach an object from all sides at once, so it is impossible to study the phenomena of life from all sides and at once. And, willy-nilly, an order of succession is established. And herein lies the gist of the matter. But this order of succession is furnished only by an understanding of life.

Only a right understanding of life imparts the proper significance and direction to science in general, and to each science in particular, regulating them according to the importance of their significance in connection with life. But if the understanding of life is not such as is implanted within all of us, then science itself will be erroneous.

Not what we call science determines life, but our conception of life determines what should be acknowledged as science. And therefore, in order that science may be science, the question must first be settled as to what is and what is not science, and to this end our idea of life must be elucidated.

I will express the whole of my thought frankly; we all know the fundamental dogma of faith of this false experimental science.

Matter and its energy exist! Energy moves; mechanical movement is converted into molecular; molecular movement is expressed by heat, electricity, nervous, and brain movement. And all the phenomena of life, without exception, present themselves as relations of energy. Everything is thus beautiful, simple, clear, and, chief of all, convenient. So that, if there is nothing of all that which we so much desire, and which so simplifies our life, then all this must be invented in some manner or other.

And here is the whole of my audacious thought: the chief portion of the energy, zeal, and activity of experimental science is founded on the desire to invent everything that is necessary for the firm establishment of so comfortable a representation.

In all the activity of this science we behold, not so much a desire to investigate the phenomena of life, as the one ever present anxiety to prove the veracity of its fundamental tenet. That force is wasted on experiments to explain the origin of organic from inorganic and psychical activity from the processes of organism. The organic does not pass into the inorganic: let us seek at the bottom of the sea, we shall find a bit of stuff which we will call the kernel, a monera.

And it is not there; we shall believe that it is to be found,—the more so as the whole infinity of centuries stands at our service, into which we can thrust everything that ought to be in our creed,—but which is not there in reality.

It is the same with the transition from organic to psychical activity. It does not yet exist. But we believe that it will exist, and we bend all the powers of our intelligence to prove the possibility of this at least.

Disputes as to that which does not concern life, namely, as to whence life proceeds—whether it is animism or vitalism, or, again, the idea of some special force—have concealed from men the principal question

of life — that question without which the conception of life loses its coherence, and have gradually led scientific men — those who should guide others — into the position of a man who walks along, and even hastens his steps, but who has forgotten precisely whither he is going.

But perhaps I am deliberately endeavoring not to see the vast results afforded by science in its present course? But, surely, no results can correct a false course? Let us concede the impossible, — that all that contemporary science desires to know of life, and of which it asserts (though it does not believe this itself) — that all this will be revealed; let us concede that all has been revealed, that all is as clear as day. It is clear how organic material arises from inorganic through adaptations; it is clear how physical energy is converted into feeling, will, thought, and that all this is known, not only to students in the gymnasiums, but to village schoolboys.

I am aware that such and such thoughts and feelings proceed from such and such movements. Well, and what then? Can I or can I not direct these movements, in order to arouse in myself such and such thoughts? The question as to how I must awaken thoughts and feelings in myself and in others remains not only unsettled, but even untouched.

I know that scientific men do not trouble themselves to answer this question. The solution of this problem seems to them very simple, as the solution of a difficult problem always seems to a man who does not understand it. The answer to the question, how to regulate our life when it is in our power, seems very easy to men of science. They say: Regulate it so that people may satisfy their wants; science provides means, in the first place, for the proper determination of wants, and, in the second, means to produce so easily and in such abundance that all wants can be easily satisfied, and then people will be happy.

But if we inquire what they call needs, and where lie the limits of needs, they simply reply: "Science — that

is what science is for — to portion them out into physical, mental, æsthetic, even moral, and plainly to define what needs are legitimate and in what measure they are illegitimate. It will define this in course of time." But if they are asked how one must guide one's self in the decision as to the legitimacy and illegitimacy of needs, they reply boldly: "By the study of the needs." But the word *need* has only two meanings: either a condition of existence, and the conditions of existence of every object are innumerable in quantity, and hence all the conditions cannot be studied; or the need of happiness for human beings can be known and determined only by consciousness, and is therefore even less susceptible of investigation by contemporary science.

There is an institution, a corporation, an assembly of some sort, either of people or of minds, which is infallible, and which is called science. It will determine all this in course of time.

Is it not evident that all this settlement of the question is merely a paraphrase of the kingdom of the Messiah, in which the part of the Messiah is played by science, and that, for the sake of having the explanation explain anything, it is necessary to believe in the dogmas of science as indisputably as the Hebrews believe in the Messiah, which is what the orthodox scientists do, with this difference only, that the orthodox Jew, representing to himself the Messiah as the envoy of God, can believe that all that the Messiah will establish by his power will be excellent, but the orthodox believer in science cannot, from the nature of things, believe that by means of the external investigation of needs the chief and only question concerning life can be decided?

CHAPTER I

THE FUNDAMENTAL CONTRADICTION OF HUMAN LIFE

EVERY man lives only for his own good, for his personal welfare. If man feels no desire for happiness, he is not even conscious that he is alive. Man cannot imagine life without the desire for happiness. To live is, for every man, the same thing as to desire and to attain happiness; to desire and to attain happiness is synonymous with living. Man is conscious of life only in himself, only in his own personality, and hence, at first, man imagines that the happiness which he desires for himself personally is happiness, and nothing more.

At first, it seems to him that he and he alone really lives.

The life of other beings seems to him not in the least like his own. He imagines it as merely the semblance of life. Man only observes the life of other beings, and learns from observation only that they are alive. Man knows about the life of other beings when he is willing to think of them, but he *knows* of his own, he cannot for a single moment cease to *know* that he lives, and hence to every man his own life only appears real life. The life of other beings about him seems to him to be merely one of the conditions of his own existence. If he does not desire evil to others, it is only because the sight of the sufferings of others interferes with his happiness. If he desires good to others, it is not at all the same as for himself—it is not in order that the person to whom he wishes good may be well placed, but only in order that the happiness of other beings may augment the happiness of his own life. Only that happiness in this life is important and necessary to a man which he feels to be his own, *i.e.* his own individual happiness.

And behold, in striving for the attainment of this, his own individual happiness, man perceives that his happiness depends upon other beings. And upon watching and observing these other beings, man sees that all of them, both men and even animals, possess precisely the same conception of life as he himself. Each one of these beings, precisely like himself, is conscious only of his own life and his own happiness, considers his own life alone of importance and real, and the life of all other beings only as a means to his individual happiness. Man sees that every living being, precisely like himself, must be ready, for the sake of his petty happiness, to deprive all other beings of greater happiness and even of life.

And, having comprehended this, man involuntarily makes this calculation; that if this is so, — and he knows that it is indubitably so, — then, not one being or not half a score of beings only, but all the innumerable beings in the world, for the attainment, each of his own object, are ready every moment to annihilate him, — that man for whom alone life exists. And, having apprehended this, man sees that his personal happiness, in which alone he understands life, is not only not to be easily won by him, but that it will assuredly be taken from him.

The longer a man lives, the more firmly is this conviction confirmed by experience, and the man perceives that the life of the world in which he shares, composed of individualities bound together, desirous of exterminating and devouring each other, not only cannot be a happiness for him, but will, assuredly, be a great evil.

But this is not all: if the man is placed in such favorable conditions that he can successfully contend with other personalities, fearing nothing for his own, both experience and reason speedily show him that even those semblances of happiness which he wrests from life, in the form of enjoyment for his own personality, do not constitute happiness, and are but specimens of happiness as it were, vouchsafed him merely in order

that he may be the more vividly conscious of the suffering which is always bound up with enjoyment.

The longer man lives, the more plainly does he see that weariness, satiety, toils, and sufferings become ever greater and greater, and enjoyments ever less and less.

But this is not all: on beginning to become conscious of a decline of strength, and of ill-health, and gazing upon ill-health, age, and the death of others, he perceives this also in addition, that even his existence, in which alone he recognizes real, full life, is approaching weakness, old age, and death, with every hour, with every movement; that his life, besides being subject to thousands of chances of annihilation from other beings warring with him, and from ever increasing sufferings, is, in virtue of its very nature, nothing else than an incessant approach to death, to that condition in which, together with the life of the individual, will, assuredly, be annihilated every possibility of any personal happiness. The man perceives that he, his own personality, — that in which alone he feels life, does nothing but struggle with those with whom it is impossible to struggle — with the whole world; that he is in search of enjoyments which give only the semblances of happiness, and which always terminate in sufferings, and he wishes to hold back life, which it is impossible to hold back. The man perceives that he himself, his own personality, that for which, alone, he desires life and happiness, can have neither life nor happiness. And that which he desires to have — life and happiness — is possessed only by those beings who are strangers to him, whom he does not feel, and cannot feel, and of whose existence he cannot know and does not wish to know.

That which for him is the most important of all, and which alone is necessary to him, that which — as it seems to him — alone possesses life in reality, his personality, that which will perish, will become bones and worms, is not he; but that which is unnecessary for him, unimportant to him, which he does not feel to be alive, all that world of ever changing and struggling beings, that is to say, real life, will remain, and will exist forever.

So that the sole life which is felt by man, and which evokes all this activity, proves to be something deceptive and impossible; but the inward life, which he does not love, which he does not feel, of which he is ignorant, is the one real life.

That of which he is not conscious, — that alone possesses those qualities of which he would fain be the sole possessor. And this is not that which presents itself to a man in the evil moments of his gloomy moods, this is not a representation which it is possible for him not to have, but it is, on the contrary, such a palpable, indubitable truth, that if this thought once occurs to man, or if others explain it to him, he can never again free himself from it, he can never more force it out of his consciousness.

CHAPTER II

THE SOLE AIM OF LIFE

The contradiction of life has been admitted by mankind from the most ancient times. The enlighteners of mankind expounded to men the definition of life, solving the problem of this inward contradiction, but the Scribes and Pharisees conceal it from the people.

THE sole aim of life, as it first presents itself to man, is the happiness of himself as an individual, but individual happiness there cannot be; if there were anything resembling individual happiness in life, then that life in which alone happiness can exist, the life of the individual, is borne irresistibly, by every movement, by every breath, toward suffering, toward evil, toward death, toward annihilation.

And this is so self-evident and so plain that every thinking man, old or young, learned or unlearned, will see it.

This argument is so simple and natural that it presents itself to every reasoning man, and has been known to mankind ever since the most ancient times.

“The life of man as an individual, striving only toward

his own happiness, amid an endless number of similar individuals, engaged in annihilating each other and in annihilating themselves, is evil and absurdity, and real life cannot be like that." This is what man has been saying to himself from the most ancient times down to the present day, and this inward inconsistency of the life of man was expressed with remarkable force and clearness by the Indian, and the Chinese, and the Egyptian, and the Greek, and the Jewish sages; and from the most ancient times the mind of man has been directed to the study of such a happiness for man as should not be canceled by the contest of beings among themselves, by suffering, and by death. In the increasingly better solution of this indubitable, unavoidable happiness for man inviolable by contest, by sufferings, and by death, lies the whole progress of mankind during the period of our acquaintance with its life.

From the most ancient times, and among the most widely varying peoples, the great teachers of mankind have revealed to men more and more the clear definitions of life, solving its inward contradictions, and have pointed out the true happiness and true life which is proper to men.

And, since the position of all men in the world is identical, since the contradiction of his strivings after his personal happiness, and the consciousness of its impossibility is identical for every man, all the definitions of true happiness, and therefore of true life, revealed to men by the grandest minds of humanity, are identical in their nature.

"Life is the diffusion of that light which, for the happiness of men, descended upon them from heaven," said Confucius, six hundred years before Christ.

"Life is the peregrination and the perfection of souls, which attain to greater and ever greater happiness," said the Brahmins of the same day.

"Life is the abnegation of self, with the purpose of attaining blessed Nirvana," said Buddha, a contemporary of Confucius.

"Life is the path of peacefulness and lowliness, for

the attainment of happiness," said Lao-dzi, also a contemporary of Confucius.

"Life is that which God breathed into man's nostrils, in order that he, by fulfilling his law, might receive happiness," says the Hebrew sage, Moses.

"Life is submission to the reason, which gives happiness to man," said the Stoics.

"Life is love toward God and our neighbor, which gives happiness to man," said Christ, summing up in his definition all those which had preceded it.

Such are the definitions of life, which, thousands of years before our day, pointing out to men real and indestructible happiness in the place of the false and impossible happiness of the individual, solve the contradictions of human life and impart to it a reasonable sense.

It is possible not to agree with these definitions of life, it is possible to assume that these definitions can be expressed more accurately and more clearly; but it is impossible not to see that these definitions are such that the acknowledgment of them, since it does away with the inconsistencies of life, and replaces the aspiration for the unattainable happiness of the individual, by another aspiration, — for a happiness indestructible by suffering and death, imparts to life a reasonable sense. It is impossible not to see this also, that these definitions, while theoretically correct, are also confirmed by the experience of life, and that millions and millions of men, who have accepted and who do accept such definitions of life, have, in fact, proved, and do prove, the possibility of replacing the aspiration toward individual welfare by an aspiration toward another happiness, of a sort which is not to be destroyed by suffering and death.

But, in addition to those men who have understood and who do understand the definitions of life, revealed to men by the great enlighteners of humanity, and who live by them, there always have been and there are now an immense number of people who, during a certain period of their life, and sometimes their whole life long, have led and do lead a purely animal existence, being not only ignorant of those definitions which serve to

solve the contradictions of human life, but not even perceiving that contradiction of it which they solve. And there always have been and there now exist among those people, men who, in consequence of their exclusively external position, regard themselves as called upon to guide mankind, and who, without themselves comprehending the meaning of human life, have taught and do teach other people life, which they themselves do not understand ; to the effect that human life is nothing but individual existence.

Such false teachers have existed in all ages, and exist in our day also. Some confess in words the teachings of those enlighteners of mankind, in whose traditions they have been brought up, but not comprehending their rational meaning, they convert these teachings into supernatural revelations as to the past and future life of men, and require only the fulfilment of ceremonial forms.

This is the doctrine of the Pharisees in the very broadest sense, *i.e.* of the men who teach that a life preposterous in itself can be amended by faith in a future life, obtained by the fulfilment of external forms.

Others, who do not acknowledge the possibility of any other life than the visible one, reject all marvels and everything supernatural, and boldly affirm that the life of man is nothing but his animal existence from his birth to his death. This is the doctrine of the Scribes — of men who teach that there is nothing preposterous in the life of man, any more than in that of animals.

And both the former and the latter false prophets, in spite of the fact that the teaching of both is founded upon the same coarse lack of understanding of the fundamental inconsistency of human life, have always been at enmity with each other, and are still at enmity. Both these doctrines reign in our world, and, contending with each other, they fill the world with their dissensions — by those same dissensions concealing from men those definitions of life which reveal the path to the true happiness of men, and which were given to men thousands of years ago.

The Pharisees, not comprehending this definition of life, which was given to men by those teachers in whose traditions they were brought up, replace it with their false interpretations of a future life, and, in addition to this, strive to conceal from men the definition of life of other enlighteners of humanity, by presenting the latter to their disciples in the coarsest and harshest aspect, assuming that, by so doing, they will uphold the absolute authority of that doctrine upon which they found their interpretation.¹

And the Scribes, not even suspecting in the teachings of the Pharisees those rational grounds from which they took their rise, flatly reject all doctrines concerning a future life, and boldly affirm that all these doctrines have no foundation whatever, but are merely remnants of the coarse customs of ignorance, and that the forward movement of mankind consists in not putting any questions whatever to one's self concerning life which overleap the bounds of the animal existence of man.

CHAPTER III

THE ERROR OF THE SCRIBES

AND, marvelous to relate! the fact that all the teachings of the great minds of mankind so startled men by their grandeur that the rude populace attributed to them, for the most part, a supernatural character, and accepted their authors as demigods, — the very fact which serves as the chief indication of the importance of these doctrines, — that very fact serves the Scribes, so they think, as their best proof of the incorrectness and antiquated character of these doctrines.

The fact that the insignificant teachings of Aristotle, Bacon, Comte, and others have remained, and will al-

¹ The unity of the rational idea of the definition of life by other enlighteners of mankind does not present itself to them as the best proof of the truth of their teaching, since it injures faith in the senseless, false interpretations with which they replace the substance of doctrine.

ways remain, the property of a small number of their readers and admirers, and on account of their falsity, never could influence the masses, and hence were never subjected to superstitious distortions and excrescences, — this mark of their insignificance is recognized as a proof of their truth. But the teachings of the Brahmins, of Buddha, of Zoroaster, Lao-dzi, Confucius, Isaiah, and Christ are accounted superstitious and erroneous, merely because these teachings have effected a change in the lives of millions.

The fact that millions of men have lived, and do still live, according to these superstitions, because even in their mutilated form they furnish men with answers to questions about true happiness; the fact that these doctrines not only are shared by, but serve as a foundation for the thoughts of the best men of all ages, and that the theories professed by the Scribes alone are shared only by themselves, are always contested, and sometimes do not live ten years, and are forgotten as quickly as they were evolved, — does not disturb them in the least.

On no point does that false direction of learning followed by contemporary society express itself with such clearness as on the place which is held in this society by the doctrines of those great teachers of life by which mankind has lived and developed, and by which it still lives and develops itself. It is affirmed in the calendars, in the department of statistical information, that the creeds now professed by the inhabitants of this globe number one thousand. Among the list of these creeds are reckoned Buddhism, Brahmanism, Confucianism, Laodism, and Christianity. There are a thousand creeds, and the people of our day believe this implicitly. There are a thousand creeds, they are all nonsense — why study them? And the men of our time consider it a disgrace if they do not know the latest apothegms of wisdom of Spencer, Helmholtz, and others; but of Brahma, Buddha, Confucius, Mentizus, Lao-dzi, Epictetus, and Isaiah they sometimes know the names, and sometimes they do not even know that much. It never enters their heads that the creeds professed in our day number not

one thousand, but three, in all: the Chinese, the Indian, and the European-Christian (with its offshoot, Mahometanism), and that the books pertaining to these faiths can be purchased for five rubles, and read through in two weeks, and that in these books, by which all mankind has lived and now lives, with the exception of seven per cent, almost unknown to us, is contained all human wisdom, all that has made mankind what it is.

But not only is the populace ignorant of these teachings, the learned men are not acquainted with them, unless it is their specialty; philosophers by profession do not consider it necessary to glance into these books. And why, indeed, study those men who have solved the inconsistency of his life admitted by the sensible man, and have defined true happiness and the life of men?

The Scribes, not understanding this contradiction or inconsistency which constitutes the beginning of rational life, boldly assert that there is no contradiction, because they do not perceive it, and that the life of man is merely his animal existence.

Those who do see, understand and define that which they see before them—the blind man fumbles before him with a cane, and asserts that nothing exists except that which the touch of his cane reveals to him.

CHAPTER IV

THE TEACHING OF THE SCRIBES, UNDER THE CONCEPTION OF THE WHOLE LIFE OF MAN, PRESENTS THE VISIBLE PHENOMENA OF HIS ANIMAL EXISTENCE, AND FROM THEM DRAWS DEDUCTIONS AS TO THE AIM OF HIS LIFE

“LIFE is what takes place in a living being from the time of his birth to his death. A man, a dog, a horse, is born; each one has his special body; and this special body of his lives and then dies; the body decomposes, passes into other beings, but will never be the former being again. Life was, and life came to an end; the

heart beats, the lungs breathe, the body does not decompose, — which means that the man, the horse, the dog, is alive; the heart has ceased to beat, breathing has come to an end, the body has begun to decompose, — which means that it is dead, and that there is no life. Life is that process which goes on in the body of man, as well as in that of the animal, in the interval of time between birth and death. What can be clearer?"

Thus have the very rudest people, who have hardly emerged from animal existence, always looked upon life, and thus do they look upon it now. And lo! in our day, the teaching of the Scribes, entitling itself science, professes this same coarse, primitive presentation of life as the only true one. Making use of all those instruments of inward knowledge which mankind has acquired, this false teaching is systematically desirous of leading man back into that gloom of ignorance from which he has been striving to escape for so many thousand years.

"We cannot define life in our consciousness," says this doctrine. "We go astray when we observe it in ourselves. That conception of happiness, the aspiration toward which in our consciousness constitutes our life, is a deceitful illusion, and life cannot be understood in that consciousness. In order to understand life, it is only necessary to observe its manifestations as movements of matter. Only from these observations, and the laws deduced from them, can we discover the law of life itself, and the law of the life of man."¹

The science of physics talks of the laws and relations of forces, without putting to itself any questions as to what force is, and without endeavoring to explain the nature of force. The science of chemistry speaks of the relations of matter, without questioning what matter is, and without seeking to define its nature; the science of biology deals with the forms of life, putting to itself no questions as to what life is, and not seeking to define its nature. And force and matter and life are accepted

¹ Real science, knowing its proper place and hence its object, modest and hence powerful, never has said and never says this.

as real sciences, not as subjects for study, but adopted as axioms from other realms of learning, as bases of operation upon which is constructed the edifice of every separate science. Thus does real science regard the subject, and this science cannot have any injurious influence upon the masses, inclining them to ignorance. But not thus does the false, philosophizing science look upon the subject. "We will study matter and force and life; and, if we study them, we can know them," say they, not reflecting that they are not studying matter, force, and life, but merely their relations and their forms.

And behold, false science, having placed under the conception of the whole life of man its visible portion which is known to him through his consciousness, — the animal existence, — begins to study these apparent phenomena at first in the animal man, then in animals in general, then in plants, then in matter, constantly asserting, in the meanwhile, that they are studying not a few phenomena, but life itself. Their observations are so complicated, so varied, so confused, so much time and strength have been wasted upon them, that men gradually forget the original error of admitting a portion of the subject as the whole subject, and finally become fully convinced that the study of the visible properties of matter, plants, and animals is study of life itself, of that life which is known to man only through his consciousness.

What takes place is somewhat similar to that which happens when a person is showing something in the dark, and is desirous of upholding that mistake under which the spectators are laboring.

"Look nowhere," says the exhibitor, "except in the direction where the reflections appear, and, most of all, do not look at the object itself; for there is no object, but only its reflection."

This is the very thing which the false science of the Scribes of our day does, conniving with the rude throng, looking upon life without its chief definition, without its

aspiration toward happiness, which is discovered only in the consciousness of man.¹ Proceeding directly from the definition of life, independent of the aspiration toward happiness, false science observes the objects of human beings, and, finding in them aims foreign to man, forces them upon him.

The aim of human beings, as presented by these external observations, is the preservation of one's individuality, the preservation of one's species, the production of others similar to one, and the struggle for existence; and this same fancied aim of life is also thrust on man.

False science, having adopted as a base of operation an antiquated presentation of life, in which that contradiction of human life which constitutes its chief property is not visible, — this fictitious science in its most extreme deductions arrives at that point which the coarse majority of mankind requires, — at the admission of the possibility of the happiness of individual life alone, at the admission for humanity of the happiness of the animal existence alone.

False science goes much farther even than the demands of the coarse herd for whom it wishes to find an explanation, — it arrives at the assertion that it rejects the rational consciousness of man from its first flash, it arrives at the deduction that the life of man, like that of every animal, consists in the struggle for the existence of individuality, race, and species.²

CHAPTER V

THE FALSE DOCTRINES OF THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES
GIVE NEITHER EXPLANATIONS OF THE MEANING OF REAL
LIFE, NOR GUIDANCE THEREIN; THE INERTIA OF LIFE,
WHICH HAS NO RATIONAL EXPLANATION, APPEARS AS
THE SOLE GUIDE OF LIFE

“It is useless to define life; every one knows it, so let us live!” say, in their error, the men who are upheld

¹ See appendix at the end of the book, on “The false definition of life.”

² See second appendix.

by false teachings. And, not knowing what life and its happiness are, it seems to them that they live, as it may seem to a man who is being borne along by the waves without exercising any control of his course, that he is sailing to the place where he should go, and where he wishes to go.

A child is born in want or in luxury, and he receives the training of the Pharisees or of the Scribes. For the child, for the young man, there exists as yet no contradiction in life nor problems concerning it, and therefore neither the explanations of the Pharisees nor the explanations of the Scribes are necessary to him, and they cannot govern his life. He learns simply from the example of the people who live around him, and this is equally the example of the Scribes and Pharisees; and both the former and the latter live only for personal happiness, and this is what they teach him.

If his parents are poor, he learns from them that the aim of life is the acquisition of as much bread and money as possible, and as little work as possible, so that his animal person may be as comfortable as possible.

If he has been born in luxury, he learns that the aim of life is wealth and honors, so that he may pass his time in the merriest and most agreeable manner possible.

All the knowledge acquired by the poor man is of use to him only for the purpose of improving the comfortable condition of his own person. All the attainments in science and art acquired by the rich man are of use to him only for the combating of ennui, and passing the time pleasantly. The longer both of them live, the more and more strongly do they imbibe the prevailing views of men of the world. They marry, have families, and their thirst for the acquisition of animal welfare of life is augmented by the justificatory excuse of their families; the struggle with others grows fiercer, and the inertia of the custom of life arranges itself solely with a view to the welfare of the individual.

And if there occurs to either the rich or the poor man a doubt as to the reasonableness of such a life, if to either there presents itself the question, "What is the

reason for this objectless struggle for my existence, which my children will continue? or why this delusive pursuit of enjoyments, which end in suffering for me and for my children?" then there is hardly any likelihood that he will learn those definitions of life which were given long ago to mankind by its great teachers, who thousands of years before him found themselves in the same situation. The teachings of the Scribes and Pharisees so thickly veil them that he rarely succeeds in seeing them.

The Pharisees alone, to the question, "To what purpose this miserable life?" make reply: "Life is miserable, and always has been so, and must always be so; the happiness of life consists not in its present, but in the past, before life was, and in the future, after life is ended."

Brahmin, and Buddhist, and Lao-dziist, and Jewish, and Christian Pharisees always say one and the same thing. The present life is evil, and the explanation of this evil lies in the past, in the phenomenon of the world and of man; but the correction of the existing evil lies in the future, beyond the grave. All that man can do for the acquisition of happiness, not in this but in a future life, is—to believe in that teaching which we impart to you—to fulfil the ceremonial forms which we prescribe.

And the doubter, perceiving in the life of all men who are living for their own happiness, and in the life of the very Pharisees who live only for the same thing, the falsity of this explanation, and not penetrating the meaning of their reply, flatly refuses to believe them, and betakes himself to the Scribes.

"All teachings about any other life whatsoever than this which we see in the animal is the fruit of ignorance," say the Scribes. "All your doubts as to the reasonableness of your life are empty fancies. The life of worlds, of the earth, of man, of animals, of plants, have their laws, and we are investigating them, we are studying the origin of worlds, and of man, of animals and plants, and of all matter; we are also investigating

what awaits the worlds when the sun shall cool, and so forth, and what has been and what will be with man, and with every animal and plant. We can show and prove that all has been and will be as we say; besides this, our investigations will contribute to the amelioration of mankind. But of your life and your aspirations toward happiness, we can tell you nothing more than what you already know without us: you are alive, so live as best you can."

And the doubter, having received no reply to his question from these either, remains as he was before, without any guidance whatever in life, except the impulses of his own personality.

Some of the doubters, according to the reasoning of Pascal, having said to themselves: "What if all the things with which the Pharisees frighten us for non-fulfilment of their prescribed forms should be true?" and so fulfil *in their leisure time* all the dictates of the Pharisees (there can be no loss, and there is a possibility that the profit may be great), while others, agreeing with the Scribes, flatly reject any other life and all religious forms, and say to themselves: "Not I alone, but all the rest, have lived and do live thus, — let what will be, be." And this discrepancy confers no superiority on either the one set or the other; and both the former and the latter remain without any explanation whatever of the meaning of their present life.

But it is necessary to live.

Human life is a series of actions from the time a man rises until he goes to bed; every day, of actions which are possible to him, man must incessantly make his choice out of hundreds of those which he will perform. Neither the teaching of the Pharisees, which explains the mysteries of the heavenly life, nor the teaching of the Scribes, which investigates the origin of worlds and of man, and draws conclusions concerning their future fate, furnishes that guidance for actions. But without guidance in the choice of his action a man cannot live. And so the man submits, perforce, not to reason, but to

that external guidance of life which has always existed, and does exist in every community of men.

This guidance has no rational explanation, but it directs the vast majority of the actions of all men. This guidance is the habit of life of communities of men, ruling all the more powerfully over men in proportion as men have less comprehension of the meaning of their life. This guidance cannot be accurately defined, because it is composed of facts and actions, the most varied as to place and time. It is: lights upon the boards of their ancestors for the Chinese; pilgrimages to certain places for the Mahometan; a certain amount of prayer words for the Indian; it consists of fidelity to his flag, and honor to his uniform, for the warrior; the duel for the man of the world; blood-vengeance for the mountaineer; it means certain sorts of food on specified days, a particular mode of education for one's children; it means visits, a certain decoration of one's dwelling, specified manners of celebrating funerals, births, and deaths. It is an interminable number of facts and actions, filling the whole of life. It is what is called propriety, custom, and, most frequently of all, duty, and even sacred duty.

And it is to this guidance that the majority of mankind submit themselves, in spite of the explanations of life furnished by the Scribes and Pharisees. Man beholds everywhere about him, from his very childhood, men accomplishing those deeds with complete conviction and outward solemnity, and possessing no rational explanation of his life, and the man not only begins to do the same things, but even attempts to ascribe a rational meaning to these deeds. He wishes to believe that the people who do these things possess an explanation as to why, and to what end they do what they do. And he begins to be convinced that these deeds have a rational meaning, if not wholly known to him, yet known to these persons at least.

But the majority of the rest of mankind, not being possessed, any more than himself, of a rational explanation of life, find themselves in precisely the same

situation as himself. They, also, do these things only because others, who, as it seems to them, have an explanation of these deeds, demand the same from them. And thus, involuntarily deceiving each other, people become ever more and more accustomed, not only to do these things without possessing a rational explanation, but they become accustomed to ascribing to these deeds some mysterious meaning incomprehensible even to themselves. And the less they understand the meaning of what they do, the more doubtful to themselves these acts become, the more importance do they attach to them, and with all the greater solemnity do they fulfil them. And the rich man and the poor man do that which others do round about them, and they call these acts their duty, their sacred duty, reassuring themselves by the thought that what has been done so long by so many people, and is so highly prized by them, cannot but be the real business of life. And men live on to hoar old age, to death, striving to believe that if they themselves do not know why they live, others do know this—the very people who know precisely as little about it as those who depend upon them.

New people come into existence, are born, grow up, and, looking upon this whirlpool of existence called life,—in which old, gray, respected men, surrounded by the reverence of the people, assert that this senseless commotion is life, and that there is no other,—go away after being jostled at its doors. Such a man, who has never beheld an assembly of men, having seen a crowding, lively, noisy throng at the entrance, and having decided that this is the assembly itself, after having been elbowed at the door, goes home with aching ribs and under the full conviction that he has been in the assembly.

We pierce mountains, we fly round the world; electricity, microscopes, telephones, wars, parliaments, philanthropy, the struggle of parties, universities, learned societies, museums,—is this life?

The whole of men's complicated, seething activity, with their trafficking, their wars, their roads of communi-

cation, their science and their arts, is, for the most part, only the thronging of the unintelligent crowd about the doorway of life.

CHAPTER VI

DIVISION OF CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE MEN OF OUR WORLD

“BUT verily, verily, I say unto you, the time is at hand, and is even now come, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and, hearing, shall be made alive.” And this time will come.

However much a man may have assured himself, and however much others may have assured him of this,—that life can only be happy and rational beyond the grave, or that only personal life can be happy and rational,—man cannot believe it. Man cherishes in the depths of his soul an ineffaceable demand that his life shall be happy and have a rational meaning; but a life having before it no other aim than the life beyond the grave, or an impossible bliss of personality, is evil and nonsense.

“Live for the future life?” says the man to himself: “but if this life, the only specimen of life with which I am acquainted,—my present life,—must be irrational, then it not only does not confirm in my mind the possibility of another, a rational life, but, on the contrary, it convinces me that life is, in its very substance, irrational, and that there can be no other life than an irrational one.

“Live for myself? But my individual life is evil and senseless. Live for my family? For my society? For my country or even mankind? But if my individual life is miserable and senseless, then the life of every other human individual is miserable and senseless also; and therefore an endless quantity of senseless and irrational persons, collected together, will not form even one happy and rational life. Live for myself, not knowing why, doing that which others do? But, surely, I am

aware that others know no more than I why they do what they do."

The time will come when a rational consciousness will outgrow the false doctrines, and man will come to a halt in the midst of life, and demand explanations.¹

Only the rare man, who has no connection with people of other modes of life, and only the man who is constantly engaged in an intense struggle with nature for the support of his bodily existence, can believe that the fulfilment of those senseless acts which he calls his duty can be the peculiar duty of his life.

The time is coming, and is already come, when that delusion which sets forth the renunciation — in words — of this life, for the sake of preparing for one's self one in the future, and the admission of the mere individual animal existence alone as life, and so-called duty as the business of life, — when that delusion will become clear to the majority of men, and only those forced by necessity, and dulled by a vicious career, will be able to exist without being conscious of the senselessness and poverty of their existence.

More and more frequent will be men's awakening to a rational sense; they will in their graves return to life, and the fundamental contradiction of human life will, in spite of all men's efforts to hide it from themselves, present itself before the majority of men with terrible power and distinctness.

"All my life consists of a desire for happiness for myself," says the man to himself, on awakening, "but my reason tells me that this happiness cannot exist for me, and that, whatever I may do, whatever I may attain to, all will end in one and the same thing, — in sufferings and death, in annihilation. I desire happiness, I desire life, I desire a rational sense, but in myself and in all who surround me there is evil, death, and incoherence. How am I to exist? How am I to live? What am I to do?" and there is no reply.

The man looks about him, and seeks an answer to his question, and finds it not. He finds around him doc-

¹ See third appendix at the end of the book.

trines that answer questions which he has never put to himself; but there is no answer in the world surrounding him to the question which he does put to himself. There is one anxiety for men who do, without themselves knowing why, the things which others do, when they themselves know not why.

All live as though unconscious of the wretchedness of their position and the senselessness of their activity. "Either *they* are irrational or *I* am," says the awakened man to himself. "But all cannot be irrational, so it must be that the irrational one is myself. But no — the rational *I* which says this to me cannot be irrational. Let it stand alone against all the world, but I cannot do otherwise than trust it."

And the man recognizes himself as alone in all the world, with all the terrible questions which rend his soul.

But it is necessary to live.

One *I*, his individuality, bids him live.

But another *I*, his reason, says, "It is impossible to live."

The man is conscious that he has been parted in twain. And this partition rends his soul like torture.

And the cause of this partition and of his suffering seems to him to be his reason.

Reason, the loftiest of man's faculties, which is indispensable to his life, which gives to him, naked and helpless amid the powers of nature which destroy him, both means of existence and means of enjoyment, — this faculty poisons his existence. In all the world which surrounds him, among living beings, the faculties peculiar to these beings are necessary to them all in common, and constitute their happiness. Plants, insects, animals, submitting to the law of their being, live a blissful, joyous, tranquil life.

But behold, in man, this loftiest faculty of his nature produces in him such a torturing condition of things that often — with ever increasing frequency of late days — man cuts the Gordian knot of his life, and kills himself simply for the sake of escaping from the torturing in-

ward contradictions produced by intelligent consciousness which, in our day, has been carried to the last degree of tension.

CHAPTER VII

THE PARTITION OF CONSCIOUSNESS ARISES FROM THE
BLENDING OF THE LIFE OF THE ANIMAL WITH THE
LIFE OF MAN

IT seems to man that the partition of rational consciousness which has awakened within him shatters his life in fragments, and brings it to a standstill, only because he recognizes as his life that which has not been, is not, and could not be his life.

Having been reared and having grown up in the false doctrines of our world, which have confirmed in him the conviction that his life is nothing else than his individual existence, which began with his birth, it seems to man that he lived when he was a boy, a baby; then it seems to him that he has lived, without a break, when he was a youth and when he had reached full manhood. He has lived a very long time, as it seems to him, and during all that time has never ceased to live, and lo, all at once, he has reached a point where it has become indubitably clear to him that it is impossible for him to continue to live as he has lived before, and that his life has stopped and been shattered.

False teaching has confirmed him in the idea that his life is the period of time from birth to death; and, looking at the visible life of animals, he has confounded the idea of apparent life with his consciousness, and has become quite convinced that this life which he can see is his life.

The intelligent consciousness which has awakened within him, having advanced such demands as are not to be satisfied by the animal life, shows him the error of his conception of life; but the false teaching which has eaten into him prevents his confessing his error; he cannot reject his conception of life as an animal existence, and it seems to him that his life has come to a

standstill through the awakening of intelligent consciousness. But that which he calls his life, his existence since his birth, has never even existed; his idea that he has been living all the time from his birth to the present moment is an illusion of consciousness, similar to the illusion of the senses in the visions of sleep; up to the time of his awakening he had no visions, they have all formed at the moment of his awakening. Before the awakening of his intelligent consciousness, there was no life of any sort; his conception of his past life was formed at the awakening of his intelligent consciousness.

A man has lived like an animal during the period of his childhood, and has known nothing of life. If the man had lived only ten months, he would never have known anything about his own existence or any one else's; he would have known just as little of life as though he had died in his mother's womb. And not only can the baby not know, but the unintelligent grown-up men and the utter idiot cannot know, that they live, and that other human beings live. And therefore they have no human life.

Man's life begins only with the appearance of rational consciousness,—of that which reveals to man simultaneously his life in the present and the past, and the life of other individuals, and all that flows inevitably from the relations of these individuals, sufferings and death,—of that same thing which calls forth in him the renunciation of personal happiness in life, and the inconsistency which, as it seems to him, brings his life to a standstill.

Man tries to define his life by dates, as he defines an existence outside himself which he sees, and all of a sudden a life awakens in him which does not correspond with the date of his birth in the flesh, and he does not wish to believe that that which is not defined by a date can be life. But seek as a man may in time that point which he can consider as the beginning of his rational life, he will never find it.¹

¹ Nothing is more common than to hear discussions as to the birth and development of man's life, and of life in general, in time. It seems to

He will never find in his reminiscences, that point, that beginning of rational consciousness. He imagines that rational consciousness has always existed in him. But if he does find something which bears a resemblance to the beginning of this consciousness, he does not, by any means, find it in his birth in the flesh, but in a realm which has nothing in common with that birth in the flesh. He recognizes his rational origin not as at all the same as his birth in the flesh seems to him. When questioning himself as to his rational consciousness a man never thinks that he, as a rational being, was the son of his father and mother and the grandson of his grandfathers and grandmothers, who were born in such and such a year; but he always recognizes himself, not as a son, but as joined in one with the consciousness of other reasoning beings, the most remote from him in point of time and place, who have sometimes lived a thousand years before him, and at the other end of the world. In his rational consciousness man does not even perceive his origin at all, but he recognizes his union, independent of time and space, with other rational consciousnesses, so that they enter into him and he enters into them. And this rational consciousness, awakened in man, seems to bring to a halt that semblance of life which the error of men regards as life: to people in error it seems that their life stops just when it has first been aroused.

people who reason thus that they stand on the very firm ground of reality, but, nevertheless, there is nothing more fantastic than discussions of the development of life in time. These discussions resemble the actions of a man who should undertake to measure a line, and who should not place a mark at the one point which he knows, on which he stands, but should take imaginary points on an endless line, at various and indefinite distances from himself, and from them should measure the distance to himself. Is not this the very thing that men do when they discuss the origin and development of life in man? In fact, where can we take on that endless line which represents development — from the past in the life of man, — that arbitrary point, from which it is possible to begin the fantastic history of the development of this life? In the birth or generation of the child or of his parents, or still further back, in the original animal, and protoplasm, in the first bit that broke away from the sun? Surely, all these discussions will be the most arbitrary fantasies — a measuring without measures.

CHAPTER VIII

THERE IS NO DIVISION AND CONTRADICTION, IT ONLY SO
APPEARS THROUGH FALSE DOCTRINE

ONLY the false doctrine of human life, as the existence of an animal from birth to death, in which men are reared and abide, produces that torturing condition of division into which men enter on the discovery in them of their rational consciousness.

To a man who finds himself laboring under this error, it seems as though the life within him were being rent in twain.

Man knows that his life is a unit, but he feels that it consists of two parts. A man, when he crooks two fingers, and rolls a little ball between them, knows that there is but one ball, but he feels as though there were two balls. Something of the same sort occurs with the man who has acquired a false idea of life.

A false direction has been imparted to the mind of man. He has been taught to recognize as life his one fleshly, individual existence, which cannot be life.

With the same false conception of life as he imagines it, he has looked upon life and has beheld two lives,—the one which he has imagined to himself, and the one which actually exists.

To such a man it seems as though the renunciation by his rational consciousness of the happiness of individual existence, and the demand for a different happiness, is something sickly and unnatural.

But, for man as a rational being, the renunciation of the possibility of personal happiness and life is the inevitable consequence of the conditions of individual life, and a property of the rational consciousness connected with it. The renunciation of personal happiness and life is, for a rational being, as natural a property of his life as flying on its wings, instead of running on its feet, is for a bird. If the feathered fowl runs on its legs, it does not prove that it is not its nature to fly. If we see

around us men with unawakened consciousness, who consider that their life lies in their happiness as individuals, this does not prove that man is incapable of living a rational life. The awakening of man to the true life which is peculiar to him takes place in our society with such a painful effort, merely because the false teaching of the world strives to convince men that the phantom of life is life itself, and that the appearance of true life is the violation of it.

With the people of our society who enter into true life, something of the same sort happens as would take place with a maiden from whom the nature of woman had been concealed. On feeling the symptoms of sexual maturity, such a maiden would take a condition which summons her to the future family life, for an unhealthy and unnatural condition, and be driven to despair.

The self-same despair is felt by the men of our society at the first symptoms of awakening to the real life of man.

The man in whom rational consciousness has awakened, but who, at the same time, understands his life only as an individual, finds himself in that position of torture in which an animal would find itself, which, having acknowledged its life as the movement of matter, should not have recognized its law of individuality, but should have merely seen its life in subjection to laws of matter that would go on even without its efforts. Such an animal would experience a painful inward contradiction and division. By submitting itself to the one law of matter, it would see that its life consists in lying still and breathing, but its individuality would have required something else from it; food for itself, a continuation of its species, — and then it would seem to the animal that it suffered division and contradiction. "Life," it would say to itself, "consists in submitting to the laws of gravity, *i.e.* in not moving, in lying still, and in submitting to the chemical processes which go on in the body, and lo, I am doing that, but I must move, and procure myself food, and seek a male or a female." The animal would suffer, and would perceive in this condition a painful inconsistency and division.

The same thing takes place with a man who has been taught to recognize the lower law of his life, the animal individuality, as the law of his life. The highest law of life, the law of his rational consciousness, demands from him another; and the life surrounding him on all sides, and false doctrines, retain him in a deceptive consciousness, and he feels contradiction and division.

But as the animal, in order that it may cease to suffer, must confess as its law not the lower law of matter, but the law of its individuality, and, by fulfilling it, profit by the laws of matter for the satisfaction of its aims as an individual, exactly so is it only requisite for a man to recognize his life not in the lower law of individuality, but in the higher law, which includes the first law,—in the law revealed to him in his rational sense,—and the inconsistency is annihilated, and he, as an individual, will be free to submit himself to his rational consciousness, and it will serve him.

CHAPTER IX

THE BIRTH OF TRUE LIFE IN MAN

By observing the times, by watching the appearance of life in the human being, we see that true life is preserved in man as it is preserved in the seed; and that a time comes when this life makes its appearance. The appearance of true life consists in the animal personality inclining man to his own happiness, while his rational sense shows him the impossibility of personal happiness, and points him to another happiness. Man looks at this happiness, which is pointed out to him in the distance, is incapable of seeing it, at first does not believe in this happiness, and turns back to personal happiness; but the rational consciousness, which thus indistinctly indicates his happiness to him, so indubitably and convincingly demonstrates the impossibility of individual happiness that man once more renounces individual happiness and takes another look at this new happiness

which has been pointed out to him. No rational happiness is visible, but individual happiness is so indubitably destroyed that it is impossible to continue individual existence; and in the man there begins to form a new relation of his animal to his rational consciousness. The man begins to be born into the true life of mankind.

Something of the same sort takes place which takes place in the material world at every birth. The child is born not because it desires to be born, because it is better for it to be born, and because it knows that it is good to be born, but because it is ready, and can no longer continue its previous existence; it must yield itself to a new life, not so much because the new life calls it, as because the possibility of the former existence has been annihilated.

Rational consciousness imperceptibly springing up in his person grows to such a point that life in individuality becomes impossible.

What takes place is precisely what takes place at the birth of everything. The same annihilation of the germ of the previous form of life, and the appearance of a new shoot; the same apparent strife of the preceding form, decomposing the germ, and the increase in size of the shoot, — and the same nourishment of the shoot at the expense of the decomposing germ. The difference for us between the birth of the rational consciousness and the fleshly birth visible to us consists in this, — that, while in the fleshly birth we see, in time and space, from what and how, when and what is born from the embryo, we know that the seed is the fruit, that from the seed, under certain well-known conditions, a plant will proceed, that there will be a flower upon it, and then fruit, of the same sort as the seed (the entire cycle of life is accomplished before our very eyes), — we do not perceive the growth of the rational consciousness in time, and we do not see its cycle. We do not see all the growth of the rational consciousness, and its cycle, because we are ourselves accomplishing it; our life is nothing else than the birth of this being, invisible to us,

which is brought forth within us, and hence we can in no wise see it.

We cannot see the birth of this new being, of this new relation of the rational consciousness to the animal, just as the seed cannot see the growth of its stalk. When the rational consciousness emerges from its concealed condition, and reveals itself to us, it seems to us that we experience a contradiction. But there is no contradiction whatever, as there is none in the sprouting seed. In the sprouting seed we perceive only that the life, which formerly resided only within the covering of the seed, has now passed into its shoot. Precisely the same in man, on the awakening of the rational consciousness there is no contradiction whatever, there is only the birth of a new being, of a new relationship of the rational consciousness to the animal.

If a man exists without knowing that other individuals live, without knowing that pleasures do not satisfy him, that he will die, — he does not even know that *he* lives, and there is no contradiction in him.

But if a man has perceived that other individuals are the same as himself, that sufferings menace him, that his existence is a slow death, he will no longer place his life in that decomposing individuality, but he must inevitably place it in that new life which is opening before him. And again there is no contradiction, as there is no contradiction in the seed which sends forth a shoot and then dies.

CHAPTER X

REASON IS THAT LAW ACKNOWLEDGED BY MAN ACCORDING TO WHICH HIS LIFE MUST BE ACCOMPLISHED

THE true life of man, revealed in the relation of his rational consciousness to his animal individuality, begins only when renunciation of individual happiness begins. But what is this rational sense? It only begins when the renunciation of the happiness of the animal personality begins. But the renunciation of the happiness of

the animal individuality only begins when the rational consciousness is aroused.

But what is this rational consciousness? The gospel of John begins by saying that the Word, *Logos* (sense, wisdom, word), is the beginning, and that in it is all and from it comes all; and that therefore reason is that which determines all the rest, and which cannot be determined by anything else.

Reason cannot be determined, and we are not called upon to determine it, because we all of us not only know it, but because reason is the only thing that we do know. Communicating one with another, we are convinced beforehand, more than of anything else, of the identical obligation for all of us of this common reason. We are convinced that reason is the only foundation which unites all of us living beings together in one. We know reason most firmly and earliest of all, so all that we know in the world we know only because that which we know is consonant with the laws of that reason which is indubitably known to us. We know reason, and it is impossible for us not to know it. It is impossible, because reason is that law by which reasoning beings—men—must inevitably live. Reason is for man that law in accordance with which his life is perfected, such a law as is that law for the animal in accordance with which it feeds and reproduces itself, as is that law for the plant in accordance with which grows and blossoms the grass or the tree, as is that law for the heavenly bodies in accordance with which the earth and the stars move. And the law which we know in ourselves as the law of our life is that law in accordance with which are accomplished all the external phenomena of the world; only with this difference,—that we know this difference, that we know this law in ourselves, as that which *we* ourselves must fulfil, and in external phenomena as that which is fulfilled, in accordance with that law, without our participation. All that we know about the world is only what we see accomplished outside of us, in the heavenly bodies, in animals, in plants, in all the world, subject to reason.

In the outer world we see this subjection to the law of reason; but in ourselves we know this law as that which we are bound to fulfil.

The common error in regard to life consists in this, — that the subjection of our animal body to the law, not accomplished by us, but only seen by us, is taken for human life; while this law of our animal body, with which our rational consciousness is bound up, is accomplished in our animal bodies as unconsciously to ourselves as it is accomplished in a tree, a crystal, a heavenly body.

But the law of our life — the subservience of our animal body to our reason — is the law which we nowhere see, because it has not yet been accomplished, but is accomplished by us in our life. In the fulfilment of this law, in the subjection of our animal part to the law of reason for the attainment of happiness, consists our life. By not understanding that the happiness of our life consists in the subjection of our animal individuality to the law of reason, and taking happiness and the existence of our animal individuality for our whole life, and rejecting the work of life which has been appointed for us, we deprive ourselves of our true happiness and our true life; in place of it we set up that existence which we can see, of our animal activity, which operates independently of us, and which cannot, therefore, be our life.

CHAPTER XI

THE FALSE DIRECTION OF LEARNING

THE error of supposing that the law accomplished in our animal persons, and visible to us, is the law of our life, is an ancient one, into which men have always fallen, and into which they still fall. This error, concealing from men the chief subject of their knowledge, the subjection of the animal individual to reason for the attainment of the happiness of life, sets in its place a

study of the existence of men independent of the happiness of life.

Instead of making a study of that law to which, for the attainment of his happiness, the animal individuality of man must be subjected, and, as soon as this law is learned, studying, with it as a foundation, all the other phenomena of the world, this false knowledge directs its efforts only to the study of happiness, and of the existence of the animal individuality of man, without any relation to the chief subject of knowledge, — the subjection of this animal individuality of man to the law of reason for the attainment of the happiness of true life.

False knowledge directs its efforts to the study of happiness alone, and, not having in view the chief object of knowledge, directs its efforts to the study of the animal existence of past and contemporary people, and to the study of the conditions of existence of man in general, as an animal. It seems to it that from this study there may be derived also a guide for the happiness of human life.

False knowledge reasons thus: "Men exist and have existed before us. Let us see how they have existed, what changes have come about in their existence through time and situation, in what direction these changes point. From these historical alterations in their existence we shall discover the law of their life."

Not having in view the principal aim of learning, the study of that rational law to which the personality of man must submit itself for his happiness, the so-called learned men of this category, by the very aim which they set themselves for their study, pronounce the condemnation on the futility of their study.

In point of fact: if the existence of men alters only in consequence of the general laws of their animal existence, then the study of those laws, to which it is thus subjected, is utterly useless and vain. Whether men know or do not know about the law of change in their existence, this law is accomplished, exactly as the change is accomplished in the life of moles and beavers, in con

sequence of those conditions in which they find themselves.

But if it is possible for man to know that law of reason to which his life must be subservient, then it is evident that he can nowhere procure the knowledge of that law of reason, except where it is revealed to him : in his rational consciousness. And therefore, however much men may have studied the subject of how men have *existed* as animals, they will never learn concerning the existence of man anything which would not have taken place of itself in men without the acquirement of that knowledge ; and no matter how much they have studied the animal existence of man, they will never learn the law to which, for the sake of his life's happiness, the animal existence of man must be subjected.

This is one category of the vain reasonings of men upon life, called historical and political science.

Another category of reasonings, widely disseminated in our day, in which the only object of knowledge is utterly lost sight of, is as follows : —

“Looking upon man as an object of knowledge,” say the wise men, “we see that he is nourished, grows, reproduces his species, becomes old and dies, exactly like any other animal ; but some phenomena (psychical, as they are designated) prevent accuracy of observation, present too great complications, and hence, in order the better to understand man, we will first examine his life in simpler phenomena, similar to those which we see in animals and plants, which lack this psychical activity.

“With this aim, we will investigate the life of animals and plants in general. But, on investigating animals and plants, we see that in all of them there reveal themselves still more simple laws of matter, which are common to them all. And as the laws of the animal are simpler than the laws of the life of man, and the laws of the plant simpler still, investigation must be based upon the simplest — upon the laws of matter. We see that what takes place in the plant and the animal is precisely what takes place in the man,” say they, “and hence we conclude that everything which takes place in

man we can explain to ourselves from what takes place in the very simplest dead matter that is visible to us, and open to our investigations, the more so as all the peculiarities of the activity of man are found in constant dependence upon powers which act in matter. Every change of the matter constituting the body of man alters and infringes upon his whole activity." And hence, they conclude, the laws of matter are the cause of man's activity. But the idea that there is in man something which we do not see in animals or in plants, or in dead matter, and that this something is the only subject of knowledge, without which every other is useless, does not disturb them.

It does not enter their heads that, if the change of matter in the body of man infringes upon his activity, —this merely proves that the change of matter is one of the causes which affects the activity of man, but not that the movement of matter is one of the causes of man's activity being interfered with, nor in the least that the movement of matter is the cause of his activity. Exactly as the injury done by the removal of earth from under the root of a plant proves that the earth may or may not be everywhere, but not that the plant is merely the product of the earth. And they study in man that which takes place also in dead matter, and in the plant, and in animals, assuming that an explanation of the laws, and the phenomena accompanying the life of man, can elucidate for them the life of man itself.

In order to understand the life of man, that is to say, that law to which, for the happiness of man, his animal person must be subservient, men examine either historical existence, but not the life of man, or the subservience, not acknowledged by man but only seen by him, of the animal and the plant, and of matter, to various laws; *i.e.* they do the same thing that men would do if they studied the situation of objects unknown to them, for the sake of finding that unknown goal which must be followed.

It is perfectly true that the knowledge of the phenomenon, visible to us, of the existence of man in

history, may be instructive for us; and that the study of the laws of the animal individuality of man and of other animals may be equally instructive for us, as well as the study of those laws to which matter is subject. The study of all this is important for man, since it shows him, as in a mirror, that which is infallibly accomplished in his life; but it is evident that the knowledge of that which is already in process of accomplishment and visible to us, however full it may be, cannot furnish us with the chief knowledge, which is necessary to us, the knowledge of that law to which, for our happiness, our animal individuality must be subservient. The knowledge of the laws that are accomplished is instructive for us, but only when we acknowledge that law of reason to which our animal personality must be subservient, but not when that law is not recognized at all.

However well the tree may have studied (if it could but study) all those chemical and physical phenomena which take place in it, it can by no means, from these observations and from this knowledge, deduce for itself the necessity of collecting sap and of distributing it for the growth of the bole, the leaf, the flower, and the fruit.

Precisely this is the case with man; however well he may know the law which guides his animal personality, and the laws which control matter, — these laws will afford him not the slightest guidance as to how he is to proceed with the bit of bread which is in his hands: whether he is to give it to his wife, to a stranger, to a dog, or to eat it himself; to defend this bit of bread, or to give it to the person who shall ask him for it. But a man's life consists solely of the decision of these and similar questions.

The study of laws which guide the existence of animals, plants, and matter is not only useful but indispensable for the elucidation of the law of the life of man, but only when that study has as its chief aim the subject of man's knowledge: the elucidation of the law of reason.

But on the assumption that the life of man is merely his animal existence, and that the happiness indicated by rational consciousness is impossible, and that the law of reason is but a vision, — such study becomes not only vain but deadly, since it conceals from man the sole object of knowledge, and maintains him in the error that, by following up the reflection of the object, he can know the object also. Such study is similar to that which a man should make by attentively studying all the changes and movements of the shadow of the living being, assuming that the cause of the movement of the living being lies in the changes and movements of its shadow.

CHAPTER XII

THE CAUSE OF FALSE KNOWLEDGE IS THE FALSE PERSPECTIVE IN WHICH OBJECTS PRESENT THEMSELVES

“TRUE knowledge consists in knowing that we know that which we know, and that we do not know that which we do not know,” said Confucius.

But false knowledge consists in thinking that we know that which we do not know. And it is impossible to give a more accurate definition of that false knowledge which reigns among us. It is assumed by the false knowledge of our day that we know that which we cannot know, and that we do not know that which alone we can know. It seems to a man possessed of false knowledge that he knows everything which presents itself to him in space and time, and that he does not know that which is known to him through his rational consciousness.

To such a man it seems that happiness in general, and his happiness in particular, is the most unfathomable of subjects for him. His reason and his rational consciousness seem to him as almost equally unfathomable subjects. A little more comprehensible subject appears to be himself as an animal; still more compre-

hensible appear to him animals and plants, and more comprehensible still seems dead, endlessly diffused matter.

Something of the same sort takes place with man's vision. A man always unconsciously directs his sight chiefly on the objects which are more distant, and which therefore seem to him the most simple in color and outline; on the sky, the horizon, the far-off meadows, the forest. These objects present themselves to him as better defined and more simple in proportion as they are more distant, and, *vice versa*, the nearer the object, the more complicated is it in outline and color.

If man did not know how to compute the distance of objects, he would not, as he looked, arrange objects in perspective, but would acknowledge the great simplicity and definiteness of outline and color, their greater degree of visibility; and to such a man the interminable sky would appear the simplest and most visible, and then as less visible objects would the more complicated outlines of the horizon appear to him, and still less visible would appear to him his own hands, moving before his face, and light would appear to him the most invisible of all.

Is it not the same with the false knowledge of man? What is indubitably known to him — his rational consciousness — seems to him to be beyond comprehension, while that which is, indubitably, unattainable for him — boundless and eternal matter — seems to him to be within the scope of knowledge, because on account of its distance from him it seems simple to him.

But it is precisely the reverse. First of all, and most indubitably of all, every man can know and does know the happiness toward which he is striving; then, as indubitably, he knows the reason which points out to him that happiness, — he already knows that his animal part is subject to that reason, and he already sees, though he does not know, all the other phenomena which present themselves to him in space and time.

Only to the man with a false idea of life does it seem that he knows objects better in proportion as they are

more clearly defined by time and space; in point of fact, we know fully only that which is defined neither by time nor by space: happiness and the law of reason. But we know external objects the less in proportion as our consciousness has less share in the knowledge, in consequence of which an object is defined only by its place in time and space. And hence, the more exceptionally an object is defined by time and space, the less comprehensible is it to man.

The true knowledge of man ends with the knowledge of his individuality—of the animal part. A man knows his animal part, which seeks happiness and is subject to the law of reason, quite apart from the knowledge of that which is not his individuality. He actually knows himself in this animal; and knows himself, not because he is something appertaining to time and space (on the contrary, he never can know himself as a phenomenon appertaining to time and space), but because he is something which must, for its own happiness, be subservient to the law of reason. He knows himself in this animal as something independent of time and space.

When he questions himself as to his place in time and space, it seems to him, first of all, that he stands in the middle of time, which is endless on both sides of him, and that he is the center of a sphere, whose surface is everywhere and nowhere. And this self of his, exempt from time and space, man actually knows, and with this, his "*ego*," ends his actual knowledge. All that is contained outside of this, his "*ego*," man does not know, and he can only observe and define it in an external and conventional manner.

Having departed, for a time, from the knowledge of himself as a rational center, striving toward happiness, *i.e.* as a being independent of time and space, man can, for a time, conditionally admit that he is part of the visible world appearing in time and space. Regarding himself thus, in time and space, in connection with other beings, man combines his true inward knowledge of himself with external observations on himself, and

receives of himself a conception of a man in general, similar to all other men; through this conventional knowledge of himself man conceives of other men, also, a certain external idea, but he does not know them.

The impossibility, for man, of true knowledge of men, proceeds also from the fact that of such men he sees, not one, but hundreds, thousands, and he knows that there have existed and that there will exist men whom he has never seen and whom he never will see.

Beyond men, still farther removed from himself, man beholds, in time and space, animals differing from men and from each other. These creatures would be utterly incomprehensible to him if he were not possessed of a knowledge of man in general; but, having this knowledge, and deducing from his conception of man his rational consciousness, he receives some idea concerning animals also; but this idea is for him less like knowledge than his idea of men in general. He beholds a vast quantity of the most varied animals, and the greater their numbers, the less possible, apparently, is any knowledge of them for him.

Farther removed from himself he beholds plants; and the diffusion of these phenomena in the world is even greater, and knowledge of them is still more impossible for him.

Still farther from him, beyond animals and plants, in space and time, man beholds living bodies, and forms of matter which are but little or not at all distinguishable from each other. Matter he understands least of all. The knowledge of the forms of matter is already quite indifferent to him, and he not only does not know it, but he only imagines it to himself, the more so as matter already presents itself to him, in space and time, as endless.

CHAPTER XIII

THE RECOGNIZABILITY OF OBJECTS IS AUGMENTED, NOT BECAUSE OF THEIR MANIFESTATION IN SPACE AND TIME, BUT BECAUSE OF THE UNITY OF THE LAW WHERETO WE AND THOSE SUBJECTS WHICH WE STUDY ARE SUBSERVIENT

WHAT can be more clear than the words: the dog is sick; the calf is affectionate; he loves me; the bird rejoices; the horse is afraid; a good man; a vicious animal? And all these most important and comprehensible words are not defined by space and time; on the contrary, the more incomprehensible to us the law to which a phenomenon is subservient, the more accurately is the phenomenon defined by time and space. Who will say that he understands that law of gravity in accordance with which the movements of the earth, moon, and sun take place? Yet an eclipse of the sun is determined in the most accurate manner by space and time.

We know fully only our life, our aspiration for happiness, and the reason which points us to that happiness. The knowledge which stands next to it in point of sureness is the knowledge of our animal personality, striving toward happiness and subservient to the law of reason. In the knowledge of our animal personality there already appear conditions of time and space, visible, palpable, observable, but not accessible to our understanding. After this, in point of sureness of knowledge, is the knowledge of animal personalities, similar to ourselves, in which we recognize an aspiration toward happiness, as well as a rational consciousness, in common with ourselves. In so far as the life of these personalities approaches the laws of our life, of aspiration toward happiness, and submission to the law of reason, to that extent do we know them; in so far as it reveals itself under conditions of time and space, to that extent we do not know them. Thus, more than in any other way, do we know men.

The next thing in point of surety of knowledge is our knowledge of animals, in which we see a personality striving toward welfare, like our own,—though now we hardly recognize a semblance of our rational consciousness,—and with which we cannot communicate through that rational consciousness.

After animals, we behold plants, in which we with difficulty recognize a personality similar to our own, aspiring to happiness. These beings present themselves to us chiefly in phenomena of time and space, and are hence still less accessible to our knowledge.

We know them only because in them we behold a personality, similar to our animal personality, which, equally with ours, aspires to happiness, and matter which subjects itself to the law of reason under the conditions of time and space.

Still less accessible to our knowledge are impersonal, material objects; in them we no longer find semblances of our personality, we perceive no striving at all after happiness, but we behold merely the phenomena of time and space, of the laws of reason, to which they are subject.

The genuineness of our knowledge does not depend upon the accessibility to observation of objects in time and space, but contrariwise; the more accessible to observation the phenomena of the object in time and place, the less comprehensive is it to us.

Our knowledge of the world flows from the consciousness of our striving after happiness, and of the necessity, for the attainment of this happiness, of the subjection of our animal part to reason. If we know the life of the animal, it is only because we behold in the animal a striving toward happiness, and the necessity of subjection to the law of reason, which is represented in it by the law of organism.

If we know matter, we know it only because, in spite of the fact that its happiness is incomprehensible to us, we nevertheless behold in it the same phenomenon as in ourselves—the necessity of subjection to the law of reason, which rules it.

We cannot know ourselves from the laws which rule animals, but we can know animals only by that law which we know in ourselves. And so much the less can we know ourselves from the laws of our life transferred to the phenomena of matter.

All that man knows of the external world he knows only because he knows himself and in himself finds three different relations to the world: one relation of his rational consciousness, another relation of his animal, and a third relation of the matter which enters into his animal body. He knows in himself these three different relations, and therefore all that he sees in the world is always disposed before him in a perspective of three planes, separate from each other: (1) rational beings; (2) animals; and (3) lifeless matter.

A man always sees these three categories in the world, because he contains within himself these three subjects of knowledge. He knows himself: (1) as a rational consciousness, subjecting the animal part; (2) as an animal, subject to the rational consciousness; (3) as matter, subject to the animal part.

Not from a knowledge of the laws of matter, as they think of it, can we learn the law of organisms, and not from the laws of organism can we know ourselves as a rational creation, but *vice versa*. First of all, we may and we must know ourselves, *i.e.* that law of reason to which, for our own happiness, our personality must be subject, and only then can we and must we know also the law of our animal personality, and of other personalities like it, and, at a still greater distance from us, the laws of matter.

We need to know and we do know only ourselves. The animal world is for us a reflection of what we know in ourselves. The material world is, as it were, a reflection of a reflection.

The laws of matter seem peculiarly clear to us, only because they are uniform for us: and they are uniform for us because they are especially far removed from the law of our life as we recognize it.

The laws of organisms seem to us simpler than the

law of our life, also on account of their distance from us. But in them we merely observe laws, but we do not know them, as we know the law of our rational consciousness, which we must fulfil.

We know neither the one being nor the other, but we merely see, we observe outside of ourselves. Only the law of our rational consciousness do we know indubitably, because it is necessary to our happiness — because we live by this consciousness; but we do not see it because we do not possess that highest point from which we might be able to observe it.

Only, if there were higher beings subjecting our rational consciousness as our rational consciousness subjects itself to our animal personality, and as our animal personality (our organism) subjects matter to itself — these higher beings might behold our rational life as we behold our animal existence and the existence of matter.

Human life presents itself as indissolubly bound up with two modes of existence, which it includes within itself: the existence of animals and plants (of organisms), and the existence of matter.

Man himself makes his real life, and lives it; but in the two modes of existence bound up with his life, man cannot take part. Body and matter, of which he consists, exist of themselves.

These forms of existence present themselves to man as preceding lives lived through, included in his life, as reminiscences of former lives.

In the real life of man, these two forms of existence furnish him with implements and materials for his work, but not the work itself.

It is useful for a man to study thoroughly both the materials and the implements of his work. The better he knows them, the better condition will he be in to work. The study of these forms of existence included within his life, of his animal and the material constituting the animal, shows man, as though in a reflection, the universal law of all existence — submission to the law of reason, and thereby confirms, as to his conviction, the necessity of subjecting his animal to its laws; but

man cannot and must not confound the material and implements of his work with the work itself.

However much a man may have studied the visible, palpable life, observed by him in himself and in others, the life which is fulfilled without any effort of his, this life will always remain a mystery to him; he will never understand a life of which he is unconscious, and by observations upon this mysterious life, which is always hiding from him in the infinity of space and time, he will be in no wise enlightened as to his real life, which is revealed to him in his consciousness, and which consists in the subservience of his animal personality, quite peculiar from all and well known to himself, to the law of reason, quite peculiar and well known to himself, for the attainment of his happiness, entirely independent and well known to himself.

CHAPTER XIV

THE TRUE LIFE OF MAN IS NOT THAT WHICH TAKES PLACE IN SPACE AND TIME

MAN knows life in himself as an aspiration toward happiness, to be attained by the submission of his animal personality to the law of reason.

He does not and cannot know any other life of man. For the man recognizes the animal as living only when the matter constituting it is subject, not only to its laws, but to the higher law of organism.

There is in a certain conjunction of matter submission to the higher law of organism; we recognize life in this conjunction of matter; no, this submission has not begun or ended; and that does not yet exist, which distinguishes this matter from all other matter, in which act only mechanical, physical, and chemical laws, — and we do not recognize in it the life of the animal.

In precisely the same manner, we recognize people like ourselves, or even ourselves, as living only when our animal personality, in addition to submission to the

law of organism, is subservient to the higher law of our rational consciousness.

As soon as there is none of this submission of the personality to the law of reason, as soon as the law of personality alone acts in man, subjecting to itself the matter which constitutes it, we do not know and we do not see human life either in others or in ourselves, as we do not see the life of the animal in matter, which is subject only to its own laws.

However powerful and rapid may be a man's movements in delirium, in madness, in agony, in intoxication, in a burst of passion even, we do not recognize a man as alive, we do not bear ourselves toward him as to a living man, and we recognize in him only the possibility of life. But however weak and motionless a man may be, if we see that his animal personality is subservient to his reason, we recognize him as living, and bear ourselves toward him as such.

We cannot understand man's life otherwise than as the subjection of the animal personality to the law of reason.

This life reveals itself in space and time, but is not defined by the conditions of space and time, but only according to the degree of subjection of the animal personality to the reason. Defining life by conditions of space and time is precisely the same as defining the height of an object by its length and breadth.

The movement upward of an object which is also moving on a plane surface will furnish an accurate simile of the relationship of the true life of man to the life of the animal personality, or of the true life to the life of time and space. The movement of the object upward does not depend upon its movement on a plane surface, and can be neither augmented nor diminished thereby. It is the same with the definition of the life of man. True life always reveals itself in personality, and does not depend upon and cannot be either augmented or diminished by this, that, or the other existence of personality.

The conditions of time and space, in which the

animal personality of man finds itself, cannot wield influence over the true life, which consists of the submission of the animal personality to the rational consciousness.

It is beyond the power of man, who desires to live, to annihilate or to arrest the movement of his existence in time and space; but his true life is the attainment of happiness by submission to reason, independently of those visible movements of time and space. It is only in this increasing attainment of happiness, through submission to reason, that what constitutes the life of man consists. There is none of this augmentation in submission, and man's life proceeds in the two visible directions of time and space, and is one existence.

There is this upward movement, this greater and greater submission to reason, — and between two powers and one a relationship is established; and more or less movement takes place in accordance with the rising existence of man in the realm of life.

The powers of time and space are definite, final, incompatible with the conception of life, but the power of aspiration toward good through submission to reason is a power rising on high, the very power of life, for which there are no bounds of time or space.

Man imagines that his life comes to a standstill and is divided, but these hindrances and hesitations are only an illusion of the consciousness (similar to the illusions of the external senses). Obstacles and hesitations there are not and there cannot be in real life: they only seem such to us because of our false view of life. Man begins to live with real life, *i.e.* he rises to a certain height above the animal life, and from this height he sees the shadowy nature of his animal existence, which infallibly ends in death; he sees that his existence on a plane surface is encompassed on all sides by precipices, and, recognizing the fact that this ascent on high is life itself, he is terrified by that which he has beheld from the height.

Instead of recognizing the power of his life which has raised him on high, and instead of going in the

direction revealed to him, he takes fright at what has been laid open before him from the heights, deliberately descends, and lies as low as possible, in order not to see the abysses yawning around him. But the force of rational consciousness raises him once more, again he sees, again he takes fright, and again he falls to earth in order to avoid seeing. And this goes on until he finally recognizes the fact that, in order to save himself from terror before the movement of a pernicious life, he must understand that his movement on a plane surface—his existence in time and space—is not his life, but that his life consists only in the movement upward, that in the submission of his animal personality to the law of reason lies the only possibility of life and happiness. He must understand that he has wings which raise him above the abyss; that, were it not for those wings, he never would have mounted on high, and would not have beheld the abyss. He must believe in his wings, and soar whither they bear him.

It is only from this lack of faith that proceed those phenomena which seem strange to him at first, of the fluctuation of true life, of its arrests, and the division of consciousness.

Only to the man who understands his life in its animal existence, defined by time and space, does it appear that the rational consciousness has revealed itself at times in the animal creature. And, looking thus upon the revelation in himself of rational consciousness, man asks himself when and under what conditions his rational consciousness revealed itself in him? But, scrutinize his past as carefully as he will, man will never discover those times of revelation of the rational consciousness: it will always seem to him either that it has never existed, or that it has always existed. If it appears to him that there have been gaps in rational consciousness, it is only because he does not recognize the life of rational consciousness as life. Comprehending his life only as an animal existence, determined by conditions of time and space, man tries to measure the awakening and activity of rational consciousness by the

same measure: he asks himself, "When, for how long a time, under what conditions, did I find myself in possession of rational consciousness?"

But the intervals between the awakenings of rational life exist only for the man who understands his life as the life of an animal personality. But for the man who understands his life as consisting in the activity of the rational consciousness — there can exist none of these intervals.

Rational life exists. It alone does exist. Intervals of time of one minute or of fifty thousand years are indistinguishable by it, because for it time does not exist.

The true life of man, from which he forms for himself an idea of every other life, is the aspiration toward happiness, attainable by the subjection of his personality to the law of reason. Neither reason nor the degree of his submission to it are determined by either time or space. The true life of mankind arises outside of space and time.

CHAPTER XV

THE RENUNCIATION OF HAPPINESS OF THE ANIMAL PERSONALITY IS THE LAW OF MAN'S LIFE

LIFE is a striving toward happiness.¹ A striving toward happiness is life. Thus all men have understood, do understand, and always will understand life. And hence the life of man is an aspiration toward the happiness of man, and an aspiration toward the happiness of man is human life. The common herd, unthinking men, understand the happiness of man to lie in the happiness of his animal part.

False science, excluding the conception of happiness from the definition of life, understands life in its animal existence, and hence it sees the happiness of life only in animal happiness, and agrees with the error of the masses.

¹ *Blago*, good, happiness, welfare.

In both cases, the error arises from confounding the personalities, the individualities, as science calls them, with rational consciousness. Rational consciousness includes in itself individuality. But individuality does not always include in itself rational consciousness. Individuality is a property of the animal, and of man as well as of the animal. Rational consciousness is the property of man alone.

The animal may live for his own body only — nothing prevents his living thus; he satisfies his individual and unconsciously plays his part, and does not know that he is an individual; but reasoning man cannot live for his own body alone. He cannot live thus because he knows that he is an individual, and therefore knows that other beings are individualities also, as well as himself, and he knows all that must result from the relations of these individualities.

If man aspired only to the happiness of his individuality, if he loved only himself, — his own individuality, — he would not know that other beings love themselves also, any more than animals know this; but if man knows that he is a personality, striving toward the same thing as all the personalities surrounding him, he can no longer strive for that happiness which evidently is evil for his rational consciousness, and his life can no longer consist in striving for his individual happiness.

It merely seems to man, at times, that his aspiration toward happiness has, for its object, the satisfaction of the demands of the animal personality. This delusion arises from the fact that man takes that which he sees proceeding in his animal part for the object of the activity of his rational consciousness. What results is something in the nature of what would take place if a man were to govern himself, in a waking state, by what he had seen in dreams.

And if this delusion is upheld by false teachings, there results in man a confounding of his personality with his rational consciousness.

But his rational consciousness always shows man that

the satisfaction of the demands of his animal personality cannot constitute his happiness, and hence his life, and therefore it draws him irresistibly toward that happiness, hence toward the life which is proper to him, and it does not become confused with his animal personality.

It is generally thought and said that renunciation of the happiness of personality is a deed worthy of a man. Renunciation of the happiness of personality is not a merit, is not an exploit, but an indispensable condition of the life of man. At the same time that a man recognizes himself as an individual, separated from all the world, he also recognizes other individuals separated from all the world, and their mutual connection, and the transparency of the happiness of his personality, and the sole actuality of happiness to be only of such a sort as may be satisfied by his rational consciousness.

In the case of an animal, activity which does not have for its object its individual welfare, but is directly opposed to that welfare, is renunciation of life; but in the case of man, it is precisely the reverse. The activity of man, directed solely to the attainment of individual happiness, is a complete renunciation of the life of man.

For the animal, who has no rational consciousness to demonstrate to him the poverty and limited character of his existence, personal happiness, and the reproduction of its species therefrom resulting, constitute the highest aim of life. But for man, personality is merely that step in existence from which the true happiness of his life, which is not synonymous with the happiness of his personality, is revealed to him.

The consciousness of individuality is not life for man, but that boundary from which his life, consisting in ever greater and greater attainment to the happiness which is proper to him, and which does not depend upon the welfare of his animal part, begins.

According to the prevalent conception of life, human life is the fragment of time from the birth to the death of his animal part. But this is not human life; this is merely the existence of man as an animal personality. But human life is something which only reveals itself in

the animal existence, just as organic life is something which only reveals itself in the existence of matter.

First of all, the apparent objects of man's personality present themselves to him as the objects of his life. These objects are visible, and hence they seem to be comprehensible.

But the aims pointed out to him by his rational consciousness seem incomprehensible, because they are invisible to him. And man, at first, finds it terrible to repulse the visible and yield himself to the invisible.

To a man perverted by the false teachings of the world, the demands of the animal which fulfil themselves, and which are visible both in himself and in others, seem simple and clear, but the new, invisible requirements of rational consciousness present themselves as conflicting; the satisfaction of them, which is not accomplished by themselves, but which a man must himself attend to, seem, in some way, complicated and indistinct. It is painful and alarming to renounce the visible idea of life and yield one's self to its invisible consciousness, as it would be painful and alarming to a child to be born, were he able to feel his birth—but there is nothing to be done when it is evident that the visible idea leads to death, while the invisible consciousness alone gives life.

CHAPTER XVI

THE ANIMAL PERSONALITY IS THE INSTRUMENT OF LIFE

SURELY no arguments can conceal from man this patent and indubitable truth, that his personal existence is something which is constantly perishing, hasting on to death, and that there can be, therefore, no life in his animal personality.

Man cannot avoid seeing that the existence of his personality from birth and childhood to old age and death is nothing else than a constant waste and diminution of this animal personality, ending in inevitable death; and

hence, the consciousness of one's life in personality, including in itself a desire for enlargement and indestructibility of personality, cannot be otherwise than uninterrupted contradiction, and suffering cannot be otherwise than evil, while the only sense of his life lies in its aspiration toward happiness.

In whatever the genuine happiness of man consists, renunciation of the happiness of his animal person is inevitable for him.

Renunciation of the happiness of the animal personality is the law of man's life. If it is not accomplished freely, expressing itself in submission to rational consciousness, then it is accomplished violently in every man at the fleshly death of his animal, when, in consequence of the burden of suffering, he desires but one thing: to escape from the torturing consciousness of a perishing personality, and to pass into another form of existence.

Entrance into life, and the life of man, is similar to that which takes place with the horse whom his master leads forth from the stable and harnesses. It seems to the horse, on emerging from the stable and beholding the light, and scenting liberty, that in that liberty is life; but he is harnessed, and driven off. He feels a weight behind him, and if he thinks that his life consists in running at liberty, he begins to kick, falls down, and sometimes kills himself. But if he does not kick he has but two alternatives left to him: either he will go his way and drag his load, and discover that the burden is not heavy, and trotting not a torment, but a joy; or else he will kick himself free, and then his master will lead him to the treadmill, and will fasten him by his halter, the wheel will begin to turn beneath him, and he will walk in the dark, in one place, suffering; but his strength will not be wasted; he will perform his unwilling labor, and the law will be fulfilled in him. The only difference will lie in this: that the first work will be joyful, but the second compulsory and painful.

"But to what purpose this personality, whose happiness I am bound to renounce, in order to receive life?" say men, who accept their animal existence as life.

"But for what purpose is this consciousness of individuality, which is opposed to the revelation of his true life, given to man?"

This question may be answered by a similar question which might be put by the animal, striving toward his aims, the preservation of his life and species.

"Why," it might ask, "this matter and its laws, mechanical, physical, chemical, and others, with which I must contend in order to attain my ends? If my calling," the animal would say, "be the accomplishment of animal life, then why all these obstacles, which must be overcome?"

It is clear to us that all matter and its laws, with which the animal contends, and which it subjugates to itself for the accomplishment of its animal existence, are not obstacles, but means for the attainment of its ends. Only by working over matter, and by means of its laws, does the animal live. It is precisely the same in the life of man. His animal personality, in which man finds himself, and which he is called upon to subject to his rational consciousness, is no obstacle, but a means whereby he attains the aim of his happiness; his animal personality, is, for man, that instrument with which he works. Animal personality is, for man, the spade given to a rational being in order that he may dig with it, and, as he digs, dull and sharpen it, and wear it out, but not in order that he may polish it up and lay it away. This talent is given to him to increase, and not to hoard. "And whoso saveth his life shall lose it. And he that loseth his life for my sake, shall find it."

In these words it is declared that we must not save but lose, and lose unceasingly; and that only by renouncing what is destined to perish, our animal personality, shall we acquire our true life, which will not and cannot perish. It is declared that our true life begins only when we cease to count as life that which was not and could not be our life, — our animal existence. It is declared that he who will save the spade which he has for the preparation of his food, to sustain his life, — that he, having saved his spade, shall lose both his food and his life.

CHAPTER XVII

BIRTH IN THE SPIRIT

"YE must be born anew," said Christ. It is not that any one has commanded man to be born, but that man is inevitably led to it. In order to see life, he must be born again into that existence through rational consciousness.

Rational consciousness is bestowed upon man in order that he may place life in that happiness which is revealed to him by his rational consciousness. He who has placed his life in that happiness has life; but he who does not place his life therein, but in his animal personality, thereby deprives himself of life. In this consists the definition of life given by Christ.

Men who accept as life their aspiration toward happiness hear these words, and not only do not admit them, but do not understand and cannot understand them. These words seem to them to mean nothing, or very little, as designating some sentimental and mystical mood, which has been let loose upon them. They cannot understand the significance of these words, which furnish the explanation of a condition that is inaccessible to them, just as a dry seed which has not sprouted could not understand the condition of a moist and already growing seed. For the dry seeds, that sun which shines in its rays upon the seed which is being born into life is only an insignificant accident, — something large and warm and light; but for the sprouting seed it is the cause of birth unto life. Just the same, for those people who have not yet attained to the inward inconsistency of the animal personality and rational consciousness, the light of the sun of reason is only an insignificant accident, only sentimental, mystical words. The sun leads to life only those in whom life has already been engendered.

No one has ever learned how, why, when, and where it is engendered; either in men or in animals and plants.

Of its origin in man, Christ has said that no one knows or can know it. And, in fact, what can a man know about the manner in which life is engendered within him? Life is the light of men, the beginning of all things; how can man know when it is engendered? That is engendered and perishes for man which does not live, that which is revealed in space and time. But true life *is*, and therefore it cannot either begin or perish.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE DEMANDS OF RATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

YES, rational consciousness indubitably, incontrovertibly says to man that, with the constitution of the world which he sees from his personality, he, his personality, can have no happiness. His life is a desire for happiness for himself, for himself in particular, and he sees that this happiness is impossible. But, strange to say, in spite of the fact that he undoubtedly perceives that this happiness is impossible for him, he still lives in the one desire for this impossible happiness — happiness for himself alone.

A man with an awakened (just awakened) rational consciousness, which has not yet, however, subjected to itself his animal personality, if he does not kill himself, lives only for the purpose of realizing that impossible happiness; the man lives and acts only in order that happiness may be his alone, in order that all people, and even all creatures, should live and work to the end that his welfare alone may be provided for, that he may enjoy himself, that for him there may be no suffering and no death.

It is astonishing: in spite of the fact that his experience and observation of life, the life of all about him, and his reason, indubitably point out to each man the inaccessibility of this, show him that it is impossible to make other living beings cease to love themselves, and love him alone; in spite of this, the life of each man consists only in this, — by means of wealth, power,

honor, glory, flattery, deceit, in some manner or other, to compel other beings to live, not for themselves, but for him alone; to force all beings to love, not themselves, but him alone.

Men have done and do everything that they can for this object, and at the same time they see that they are attempting the impossible. "My life is a striving after happiness," says man to himself. "Happiness is possible for me only when all shall love me more than themselves, and all creatures love only themselves—hence all that I do to make them love me is useless. It is useless, and I can do nothing more."

Centuries pass; men learn the distance from the planets, determine their weight, learn the structure of the sun and stars, but the question as to how to reconcile the demands of personal happiness with the life of the world, which excludes the possibility of that happiness, remains for the majority of men as insoluble a problem as it was for men five thousand years ago.

Rational consciousness says to every man: "Yes, thou must have happiness, but only on condition that all will love thee more than themselves." And the same rational consciousness demonstrates to men that this cannot be, because they all love themselves alone. And therefore the only happiness which is opened to men by rational consciousness is closed to him again by it.

Centuries pass, and the puzzle as to the happiness of man's life still remains for the majority of men insoluble. But the problem has been solved long ago. And it always seems astonishing to all who have learned the solution of the riddle that they have not themselves solved it,—it seems as though they had known it long ago and had merely forgotten it, so simply and voluntarily does the solution of that riddle, which seemed so difficult amid the false teachings of our world, offer itself.

Dost thou wish that all should live for thee, that all should love thee better than themselves? There is only one condition in which thy desire can be fulfilled,—namely, that all creatures should live for the good of others, and should love others better than themselves.

Then only canst thou and all creatures be loved by all, and then only canst thou, among their number, receive that happiness which thou desirest. But if happiness be possible for thee only when all creatures love others better than themselves, then thou, a living creature, must love other creatures more than thyself.

Only under these conditions are the happiness and the life of man possible, and only under these conditions will that be annihilated which has poisoned the life of man, — will the strife of beings, the torment of suffering, and the fear of death be annihilated.

What, in fact, has constituted the impossibility of the happiness of personal existence? In the first place, the strife among themselves of beings in search of their personal happiness. In the second, the delusion of enjoyment which leads to waste of life, to satiety, to suffering, and, in the third, — death. But it is worth while to admit mentally that man may replace the striving for his own personal happiness by a striving for the happiness of other beings, in order that the impossibility of happiness may be annihilated, and that happiness may present itself as attainable to man. Looking upon the world from his idea of life, as a striving after personal happiness, man has beheld in the world a senseless conflict of beings engaged in destroying each other. But it is only requisite that man should recognize the fact that his life lies in a striving after the good of others, in order to see the world in quite a different light; to behold, side by side with chance phenomena of the strife of beings, a constant, mutual service of each other by these beings, — a service without which the existence of the world is inconceivable.

All that is necessary is to admit this, and all previous senseless activity, directed toward the unattainable happiness of the individual, will be replaced by another activity, in conformity with the law of the world and directed to the attainment of the greatest possible happiness for one's self and the whole world.

Another cause of the poverty of personal life, and of the impossibility of happiness for man, has been the de-

ceitfulness of personal enjoyments, which waste life, and lead to satiety and sufferings. A man need only admit that his life consists in a striving after the good of others, and the delusive thirst for enjoyments will cease; and the vain, painful activity, directed to the filling of the bottomless cask of animal personality, will be replaced by an activity engaged in maintaining the life of other beings, which is indispensable for his happiness, and the torture of personal suffering, which annihilates the activity of life, will be replaced by a feeling of sympathy for others, infallibly evoking fruitful activity which is also the most joyful.

A third cause of the poverty of personal life has been the fear of death. Man has but to admit that his life does not consist in the happiness of his animal personality, but in the happiness of other beings, and the bugbear of death vanishes forever from before his eyes. For the fear of death arises only from the fear of losing the happiness of life with its death in the flesh. But if a man could place his happiness in the happiness of other beings, *i.e.* if he would love them more than himself, then death would not represent to him that discontinuance of happiness and life, such as it does represent to a man who lives only for himself. Death to the man who should live only for others could not seem to be a cessation of happiness and of life, because the happiness and the life of other beings is not only not interrupted with the life of a man who serves them, but is frequently augmented and heightened by the sacrifice of his life.

"But that is not life," replies the troubled and erring consciousness of man. "That renunciation of life is suicide." — "I know nothing about that," replies rational consciousness; "I know that such is the life of man, and that there is no other, and that there can be no other. I know more than that. I know that such a life is life and happiness both for a man and for all the world. I know that, according to my former view of the world, my life and the life of every living being was an evil and without sense; but according to this view, it appears

as the realization of that law of reason which is placed in man.

"I know that the greatest happiness of the life of every being, which is capable of being infinitely enhanced, can be attained only through this law of the service of each to all, and, hence, of all to each."

"But if this can exist as an imaginary law, it cannot exist as an actual law," replies the perturbed and erring consciousness of man. "Others do not now love me more than themselves, and therefore I cannot love them more than myself, and deprive myself of enjoyment, and subject myself to suffering, for their sakes. I have nothing to do with the law of reason; I desire enjoyment for myself, and freedom from suffering. But a strife is now in progress between creatures, and if I do not struggle also, the others will crush me. It makes no difference to me by what road in imagination the greatest success for all is attained—all I need at present is my own actual greatest happiness," says false consciousness.

"I know nothing about that," replies rational consciousness. "I only know that what thou callest enjoyment will only become happiness for thee when thou shalt not thyself take, but when others shall give of theirs to thee, and thy enjoyments will become superfluous and sufferings, as they now are, only when thou shalt seize them for thyself. Only then, also, shalt thou free thyself from actual suffering, when others shall release thee from them, and not thou, thyself—as now, when, through fear of imaginary sufferings, thou deprivest thyself of life itself.

"I know that an individual life, a life where it is indispensable that all should love me alone, and that I shall love only myself, and in which I shall receive as much enjoyment as possible, and free myself from suffering and death, is the greatest and most incessant suffering. The more I love myself and strive with others, the more will others hate me, and the more viciously will they struggle with me; the more I hedge myself in from suffering, the more torturing will it be-

come, and the more I guard myself against death, the more terrible will it become.

"I know that, whatever a man may do, he will attain to no happiness until he lives in harmony with the law of his life. But the law of his life is not contest but, on the contrary, the mutual service of individuals to each other."

"But I know life only in my own person. It is impossible for me to place my life in the happiness of other persons."

"I know nothing about that," replies rational consciousness; "I only know that my life and the life of the world, which has hitherto seemed to me malicious nonsense, now appear to me as one rational whole, alive and striving toward the same happiness, through submission to one and the same law of reason, which I know in myself."

"But this is impossible to me," says erring consciousness, and at the same time there is not a man who would not have done this impossible thing, who would not have placed in this impossibility the best happiness of his life.

"It is impossible to place one's happiness in the happiness of other beings;" yet there is no man who has not known a condition in which the happiness of beings outside himself has become his happiness.

"It is impossible to place one's happiness in labors and sufferings for others;" but a man need only yield to that feeling of compassion, and personal pleasures lose their sense for him, and the force of his life is transferred into toils and sufferings for the happiness of others, and these sufferings and toils become happiness for him.

"It is impossible to sacrifice one's life for the happiness of others;" but a man need only recognize this feeling, and death is not only no longer visible and terrible to him, but it appears as the highest bliss to which he can attain.

A reasoning man cannot fail to see that if we mentally admit the possibility of replacing the striving for

his own happiness, with a striving for the happiness of other beings, his life will become rational and happy, instead of senseless and poverty-stricken as before.

He cannot fail, also, to see that, by admitting the same conception of life in other people and beings, the life of the whole world, in place of the incoherence and harshness which were formerly apparent, will become the most rational, elevated happiness which man can desire, and that in place of its former incoherence and aimlessness, it will acquire for him a rational meaning ; to such a man the aim of life appears as the infinite enlightenment and union of beings in the world, toward which life leads, and in which men first, and afterward all other creatures, submitting themselves ever more and more to the light of reason, will understand (what is at present granted to man alone to understand) that the happiness of life is to be attained, not by the striving of each being toward his own personal happiness, but by a united striving of each creature for the good of all the rest.

But this is not all : admitting the mere possibility of a change of aspiration toward one's own personal happiness, into an aspiration for the good of other beings, man cannot fail to perceive, also, that precisely this gradual, ever increasing renunciation of his individuality, and transference of the object of his activity from himself to other beings, constitutes the whole movement in advance of mankind, and of those living beings which stand nearest to man.

Man cannot but see in history that the movement of life in general lies not in the growth and augmentation of strife of beings among themselves, but, on the contrary, in the diminution of disagreement and in the mitigation of the strife ; that the movement of life consists only in this, that the world, through submission to the law of reason, passes from enmity and discord ever more toward concord and unity.

Having admitted this, man cannot but see that those who have been in the habit of devouring each other cease to devour each other ; that those who have been

in the habit of slaying prisoners and their children cease to slay them; that warriors who have taken pride in murder are ceasing to take pride in it; that people who have been in the habit of killing animals are beginning to tame them, and to kill them less; they are beginning to subsist on the eggs and milk of animals, instead of upon their bodies; that they are beginning to restrain their destructiveness, even in the world of plants.

Man perceives that the best representatives of mankind condemn researches for gratification, exhort men to abstinence, and that the very best men, who are lauded by posterity, present examples of the sacrifice of their own existences for the good of others. Man perceives that that which he has only admitted at the demand of reason is the very thing which actually takes place in the world, and is confirmed by the past life of mankind.

But this is not all: more powerfully and convincingly than through either reason or history, and from quite a different source, as it were, does the aspiration of man's heart reveal itself to him, impelling him to immediate happiness; to that very activity which his reason has pointed out to him, and which is expressed in his heart by love.

CHAPTER XIX

THE DEMAND OF THE INDIVIDUALITY APPEARS INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE DEMAND OF RATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

REASON and judgment and history and his inward feeling, — all, it would appear, should convince a man of the justice of this conception of life; but to the man educated in the doctrines of the world it appears, nevertheless, as though the satisfaction of the demands of his rational consciousness and of his feeling could not be the law of his life.

“Not contend with others for one’s personal happiness, not seek enjoyment, not ward off suffering, and not fear death! But that is impossible, that is equivalent to renouncing the whole of life! And how am I to renounce my individuality, when I feel the demands of my individual self, and when I know, by my reason, the legitimacy of these demands?” say the cultivated men of our world, with full conviction.

And here is a noteworthy phenomenon. Laboring men, simple men, who exercise their judgment but little, hardly ever defend the demands of individuality, and always feel in themselves demands opposed to the demands of individuality; but an almost complete denial of the demands of rational consciousness and, chief of all, a refutation of the legality of those demands and a defense of the rights of the individual, are to be met with only among wealthy, refined people with cultivated judgment.

The cultivated, enervated, idle man will always prove that individuality has its inalienable rights. But the hungry man will not demonstrate that a man must eat: he knows that every one knows that, and that it is impossible either to prove or to controvert it; he will only eat.

This arises from the fact that the simple, so-called uncultivated man, having toiled all his life with his body, has not perverted his judgment, but has preserved it in all its purity and force.

But the man who has thought all his life, not only of insignificant, trivial objects, but even of such things as it is unnatural for a man to think of, has perverted his mind; his mind is no longer untrammelled. His mind is occupied with matter which is foreign to it, with a consideration of the requirements of its individuality, — with the development, the augmentation, of them, and with devising means to gratify them.

“But I am conscious of the demands of my individuality, and therefore those demands are legitimate,” say so-called men of culture, brought up in the doctrine of the world.

And it is impossible for them not to feel the demands

of their personality. The whole life of these people is directed toward the imaginary satisfaction of the happiness of the individual. But this happiness of the individual seems to them to lie in the gratification of wants. And they call all those conditions of the existence of the individual upon which they have bent their minds, wants. But the wants recognized—those upon which the mind is bent—always grow to unlimited dimensions in consequence of this recognition. But the satisfaction of these wants veils from them the wants of their real life.

Social science, so-called, places at the foundation of its investigations the doctrine of the requirements of man, forgetful of the circumstance, very inconvenient for this doctrine, that no man has any wants at all, like the man who commits suicide or the man who is dying with hunger, or that they are literally innumerable.

There are as many requirements for the existence of the animal man as there are sides to that existence, and these sides are as numerous as the radii in a sphere. Need of food, of drink, of breathing, of the exercise of all the muscles and nerves; need of labor, of rest, of pleasure, of family life; need of science, of art, of religion, of their diversity. Wants, in all these connections, of the child, the youth, the man, the old man, the young girl, the woman, the aged crone, the wants of the Chinese, the Parisian, the Russian, the Laplander. Wants corresponding to the customs of the race, and to maladies.

One might go on enumerating them to the end of his days without enumerating all which constitute the wants of the individual existence of man. All the conditions of existence may be wants, and the conditions of existence are innumerable.

Only those conditions which are recognized are called wants. But recognized conditions, as soon as they are recognized, lose their true meaning, and acquire that always exaggerated meaning which is given to them by the mind directed upon them, and which veils from it its true life.

What are called needs, *i.e.* the conditions of man's animal existence, may be compared with countless little balls which are capable of being inflated, of which some body or other should have been formed. All the little spheres are equal to each other, and have their own places, and are not impeded in any way. As long as they are not inflated, all their wants are equal, and have room, and they do not feel painful until they are recognized. But all that is necessary is to begin to inflate one sphere, and it will occupy more space than all the rest, it will crowd the rest, and be crowded itself. It is the same with wants: all that is required is to direct the rational consciousness upon one of them, and this recognized want takes possession of the whole life and makes the man's whole being suffer.

CHAPTER XX

WHAT IS REQUIRED IS, NOT RENUNCIATION OF INDIVIDUALITY, BUT ITS SUBJECTION TO RATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

YES, the assertion that man does not feel the wants of his rational consciousness, but feels only the wants of his individual part, is nothing else than an assertion that our animal desires, to the satisfaction of which we have devoted all our mind, rule us, and have hidden from us our true life as men. The weeds of our thickly grown vices have stifled the germs of true life.

And how can it be otherwise in our world, when it has been frankly admitted and is admitted, by those who consider themselves teachers of others, that the highest perfection of the isolated man is the development on all sides of the refined wants of his personality, that the happiness of the masses lies in this, that they should have many wants, and that they should be able to satisfy them, that the happiness of men consists in gratifying their wants.

How can men reared in such a doctrine do otherwise

than affirm that they do not feel the demands of rational consciousness, but feel only the wants of the individual? And how are they to feel the wants of reason when their entire mind, without reservation, has gone to the increase of their carnal desires? and how are they to renounce the demands of their desires when these desires have swallowed up their whole life?

"The renunciation of individuality is impossible," these people generally say, endeavoring intentionally to turn the question, and placing, instead of an idea of the subjection of the individuality to the law of reason, the idea of the renunciation of it.

"It is unnatural," they say, "and therefore impossible." But no one is talking about renouncing individuality. Individuality is, to the rational man, the same that breath, the circulation of blood, is to the animal. How is the animal personality to renounce the circulation of its blood? It is impossible to discuss this. Equally impossible is it to talk to the rational man about renouncing individuality. Individuality is, for the reasoning man, as indispensable a condition of his life as the circulation of the blood is a condition of the existence of his animal individuality.

Individuality, as an animal individuality, cannot present and does not present any demands. These demands are presented by a falsely directed mind; a mind directed, not to a guidance of life, not to its enlightenment, but to the inflation of the carnal desires of individuality.

The demands of the animal are always satisfied. Man cannot say, "What shall I eat?" or "Wherewithal shall I be clothed?" All these wants are guaranteed to man, as to the animal and the bird, if he lives a rational life. And, in fact, what thinking man can believe that he could diminish the wretchedness of his position by the guarantee of his individuality?

The wretchedness of man's existence arises, not from the fact that he is an individual, but from the fact that he recognizes the existence of his individuality as life and happiness. Only then do contradiction, division, and the suffering of man make their appearance.

The sufferings of the man begin only when he employs the force of his mind in the strengthening and augmentation to an unlimited extent of the growing demands of his individual, for the sake of concealing from himself the demands of reason.

It is neither possible nor necessary to renounce individuality, any more than in the case of all those conditions under which man exists; but he neither can nor must admit these conditions as life itself. He may and ought to make use of the given conditions of life, but it is impossible to look, and he must not look, upon these conditions as upon the aim of life. It is not necessary to renounce individuality, but to renounce the happiness of the individual, to cease to recognize individuality as life: this is what man must do in order to return to unity, and in order that that happiness, the striving toward which constitutes his life, may be attainable to him.

From the most ancient times the doctrine that the recognition of one's life in personality is the annihilation of life, and that renunciation of the happiness of personality is the only road to the attainment of life, has been preached by the great teachers of mankind.

"Yes, but what is this? This is Buddhism?" say the people of our day, as a rule, in reply to this. "This is Nirvana, this is standing on a pillar." And when they have said this, it seems to the people of our day that they have overthrown in the most successful manner what all know very well, and what it is impossible to conceal from any one: that individual life is poverty-stricken and can have no sense.

"This is Buddhism, Nirvana," they say; and it seems to them that with these words they have overthrown all that has been and is confessed by milliards of people, and what each of us, in the depths of his soul, knows very well, — namely, that life for the aims of the individual is pernicious and senseless, and that if there is any escape from this perniciousness and senselessness, that escape indubitably leads through the renunciation of the happiness for the individual.

The fact that the larger half of mankind has understood and does understand life thus, the fact that the grandest minds have understood life in the same manner, the fact that it is impossible to understand it otherwise, does not trouble them in the least. They are so firmly convinced that all the questions of life, if not settled in the most satisfactory manner, are set aside by the telephone, operettas, bacteriology, electric lighting, and so on, that the idea of renouncing their individual life appears to them only as an echo from ancient ignorance.

But, in the meanwhile, the unhappy men do not suspect that the very roughest Hindu, who stands for years upon one leg, in the name only of renunciation of individual happiness for Nirvana, is, without any comparison, a more living man than they, the men of our contemporary European society, who have turned to beasts, who fly all over the world on railways, and exhibit to the whole world, by the electric light, their brutish condition.

That Hindu has understood that in the life of individuality and the life of reason there is a contradiction, and he is solving it according to his light; but the men of our cultivated world have not only not comprehended this contradiction, but do not even believe that it exists. The proposition that the life of man is not the existence of the individuality of man, won by the spiritual toil of all mankind prolonged through thousands of years—this proposition has become for the man (not for the animal) not only as indubitable and unalterable a truth as the revolution of the earth or the laws of gravity, but even more indubitable and unalterable than these. Every thinking man, learned or ignorant, child or old man, understands and knows this; it is concealed only from the savage men of Africa and Australia, and from well-to-do people in our European towns and capitals who have become savage.

This truth has become the property of mankind, and if mankind does not retrograde in its illegitimate branches of learning, mechanics, algebra, astronomy, still less

can it retrograde in the fundamental and chief learning of the definition of its life. It is impossible to forget and erase from the consciousness of man that which he has gathered from his life of many thousand years—the solution of vanity and senselessness, and the wretchedness of individual life. The attempts to resuscitate the savage, antediluvian view of life as an individual existence, with which the so-called science of our European world is engaged, only exhibit more visibly the growth of rational consciousness in mankind, and demonstrate clearly how mankind has already outgrown its childish garments. And the philosophical theories of self-annihilation, and the practice of suicide, which is growing to fearful proportions, prove the impossibility of a return of mankind to the degrees of consciousness already lived through.

Life, as an individual existence, has been outlived by mankind; and it is impossible to return to it, and to forget that the individual existence of man has no sense is impossible. Whatever we may write or say or discover, to whatever point we may perfect our personal life, the renunciation of possible happiness for the individual remains an incontrovertible truth for every thinking man of our times.

“But, nevertheless, it does revolve.”

The point does not lie in overthrowing the proposition of Galileo and Copernicus, and in devising new Ptolemaic circles,—they are no longer to be devised; but the point lies in proceeding further, in drawing the most extreme conclusions from this proposition, which has already passed into the general knowledge of mankind. The same with the proposition relating to the impossibility of personal happiness, enounced by the Brahmins, and by Buddha, and Lao-dzi, and Solomon, and the Stoics, and by all the true thinkers of mankind. We must not conceal from ourselves this proposition, and get around it in every way, but boldly and clearly confess it, and draw from it the most extreme deductions.

CHAPTER XXI

THE FEELING OF LOVE IS A PHENOMENON OF THE INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITY BROUGHT INTO SUBJECTION TO RATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

It is impossible for a rational being to live for the aims of individuality. It is impossible because all roads are prohibited to it; all aims to which the animal individuality of man is drawn are plainly unattainable. Rational consciousness points out other aims, and these aims are not only attainable, but give full satisfaction to the rational consciousness of man; at first, however, under the influence of the false teaching of the world, it seems to man that these aims are opposed to his individuality.

Try as a man may, who has been reared in our world with cultivated, exaggerated desires of the individual, to acknowledge himself as an "I" in his reason, he will not feel in this "I" the aspiration toward life which he feels in his animal person. The "I" of the reason contemplates life, as it were, but does not itself live, and has no aspirations toward life; but the animal "I" must suffer, and therefore but one thing remains, — to free itself from life.

Thus, in bad faith, do the negative philosophers of our times (Schopenhauer, Hartmann) settle the question — philosophers who deny life and who yet remain in it, instead of availing themselves of the possibility of quitting it. And thus, in good faith, do suicides decide this question by quitting a life which offers them nothing but evil. Suicide presents to them the only escape from the incoherence of the human life of our times.

The argument of pessimistic philosophy and of the most commonplace suicides is as follows: there is an animal *ego* in which there is an inclination for life. This *ego* and its inclination cannot be gratified. There is another *ego*, of the reason, in which there is no inclination for life, which only critically surveys all the false joy of life, and the passion of the animal *ego*, and rejects all of it.

If I yield myself to the former, I see that I live senselessly, and that I am on my way to misery, plunging ever deeper and deeper in it. If I yield myself to the latter, to the rational *ego*, there remains within me no inclination for life. I see that to live for that which alone it pleases me to live, for my personal happiness, is awkward and impossible. It would be possible to live for rational consciousness, but there is no object in it, and I do not wish it. Serve that origin from which I proceeded — God? Why? God — if he exists — will find other servitors without me. But why should I?

It is possible to look on at all this game of life until it becomes tiresome. And when it does become tiresome, I can leave it — I can kill myself. And that is what I am doing.

This is the contradictory representation of life which mankind had reached before Solomon's day, before Buddha's, and to which the false teachers of our times wish to lead it back.

The demands of the individual are pushed to the most extreme limits of senselessness. The reason, on awakening, rejects them. But the demands of the individual have grown to such proportions, have so encumbered man's consciousness, that it seems to him that reason rejects the whole of life. It seems to him that if he eradicates from his consciousness of life all that his reason rejects, nothing will remain. He does not yet perceive what will remain. The remnant, that remnant in which is life, seems nothing to him.

"But the light shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehendeth it not."

The teaching of the truth recognizes this dilemma — either a senseless existence or a renunciation of it — and "it solves it."

The doctrine which has always been called the doctrine of happiness — the doctrine of the truth — has pointed out to people that, instead of the deceptive happiness which they seek for their animal personality, they always possess, here and now, an inalienable and actual happiness which is always attainable by them,

not that which they may receive somewhere and at some time.

This happiness is not merely something deduced from reasoning, it is not that something or other which must be sought somewhere, it is not that happiness promised somewhere and at some time, but is that very happiness which is familiar to man, and toward which every unperverted human soul is drawn.

All men know from the earliest years of their childhood that, in addition to the happiness of the animal personality, there is still another and better happiness of life, which is not only independent of the gratification of the carnal desires of the animal personality, but which, on the contrary, becomes all the greater in proportion to the renunciation of the happiness of the animal personality.

This feeling, which solves all the contradictions of human life, and gives the greatest possible happiness to man, these men know. This feeling is *love*.

Life is the activity of the animal personality, subjected to the law of reason. Reason is that law to which, for its own happiness, the animal personality of man must be rendered subservient. Love is the only reasonable activity of mankind.

The animal personality inclines to happiness ; reason demonstrates to man the delusiveness of personal happiness, and leaves but one path. Activity along this pathway is love.

The animal personality of man demands happiness ; rational consciousness shows man the misery of all beings who contend with each other, demonstrates to him that there can be no happiness for his animal individuality, shows him that the only happiness possible to him is one in which there shall be no contest with other beings, no cessation of happiness, no satiety ; in which there shall be no phantom and fear of death.

And lo, like a key made for this one lock alone, man finds in his own soul a feeling which gives him that very happiness which his reason indicates to him as the only possible one. And this feeling not only solves the

former contradictions of life, but finds in these very contradictions, as it were, a possibility of manifesting itself.

Animal individualities desire to employ for their ends the individuality of man. But the feeling of love inclines him to give his existence for the good of other beings.

The animal individuality suffers. And this suffering and its alleviation constitute the chief activity of love. The animal individuality, in striving after happiness, strives with every breath toward the greatest evil — toward death, the phantom of which has destroyed every bliss of the individual.

But the feeling of love not only annihilates this fear, but inclines man to the extremest sacrifice of his fleshly existence for the happiness of others.

CHAPTER XXII

THE MANIFESTATION OF THE FEELING OF LOVE IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR MEN WHO DO NOT UNDERSTAND THE MEANING OF THEIR LIFE

EVERY man knows that in the feeling of love there is something peculiar, capable of solving all the contradictions of life, and of giving man that full happiness in the striving for which his life consists.

“But this feeling comes rarely, continues for but a brief time, and its consequences are still worse than suffering,” say men who do not understand life.

To these men, love does not present itself as the sole legitimate manifestation of life which it represents to the rational consciousness, but merely as one among thousands of the varied accidents which occur in life; it presents itself as one of those thousands of varied moods in which man finds himself in the course of his existence: there are times when a man parades as a dandy, there are times when he is attracted by science or art, there are times when he is inclined to service, to

ambition, to acquisition ; there are times when he loves some one. The mood of love presents itself to men who do not understand life, not as the essence of human life, but as an accidental frame of mind, — and hence as independent of their will, like all the others to which man is subject in the course of his life. It is often possible even to read and to hear arguments to the effect that love is something irregular, which disturbs the regular current of life, — a torturing state of mind. Something like what it must seem to the owl when the sun rises.

It is true that even these people feel that there is in the state of love something peculiar and more important than in all other frames of mind. But, not understanding life, these people cannot understand love, and the condition of love seems to them as lamentable and as deceptive as all other conditions.

“Love? — But whom? It is not worth while to love for a time ; and to love forever is impossible.”

These words accurately express the confused knowledge of people that in love there is salvation from the misery of life, and the only thing resembling true happiness, and, at the same time, a confession that, for people who do not understand life, love cannot be an anchor of safety. There is no one to love, and all love passes away. And, therefore, love can be happiness only when there is some one to love, and when it is some one whom it would be possible to love eternally. And, as there is nothing of the kind, there is no salvation in love, and love is as much of a delusion and suffering as everything else.

And thus, and not in any other way, can people understand love, who have learned and who themselves teach that life is nothing else than an animal existence.

For such people, life does not even correspond to that conception which we all involuntarily connect with the word love. It is not a beneficial activity, giving happiness to the one who loves, and to the person loved. It very frequently happens that love, in the estimation of people who recognize life in the animal

person, is the same feeling in consequence of which one mother, for the welfare of her child, will deprive another hungry child of its mother's milk, and suffer with anxiety for the success of the nursing ; that feeling which makes the father, to his own torture, take the last bit of bread from starving men in order to provide for his children ; it is the feeling through which he who loves a woman suffers from this love, and causes her to suffer, seducing her, or killing both himself and her out of jealousy ; that feeling through which it even happens that a man violates a woman out of love ; it is that feeling through which men belonging to one association injure other associations for the sake of upholding their own fellows ; it is that feeling which makes a man torment himself over his favorite occupations, and by these same occupations cause grief and suffering to the people about him ; it is the feeling which renders a man unable to endure an insult to his beloved fatherland, strews the plain with dead and wounded, his own countrymen and others.

But even this is not all : the activity of love, for people who recognize life as lying in the happiness of the animal individuality, presents such difficulties that its manifestations become not only painful, but often impossible. "Love must not be discussed," is what is generally said by the people who do not understand life ; "but one must yield to that direct feeling of preference, of passion, for people, which one experiences—and this is genuine love."

They are right in saying that love must not be argued about, that every argument about love destroys love. But the point lies in this, — that only those people can refrain from discussing love who have already applied their reason to the understanding of life, and who have renounced the happiness of individual life ; but those people who have not attained to a comprehension of life, and who exist for the animal personality, cannot do otherwise than discuss it. It is indispensable that they should discuss it, in order to be able to give themselves over to that feeling which they call love. Every

manifestation of this feeling is impossible to them without discussion, without solving insoluble problems.

In point of fact, men prefer their own baby, their own friends, their own wife, their own children, their own country, to all other children, wives, friends, countries, and call this feeling love.

To love generally means to wish to do good. Thus we have all understood love, and we cannot understand it otherwise. And behold, I love my child, my wife, my country, *i.e.* I desire the welfare of my baby, my wife, my country, rather than the welfare of children, wives, and countries. It never happens, and it never can happen, that I should love only my baby, or wife, or my own country only. Every man loves his baby, and wife, and children, and country, and men in general, together. Meanwhile, those conditions of happiness which, because of his love, he desires for the different objects of his love, are so connected together that every loving activity of man, for one of his beloved beings alone, not only interferes with his activity for others, but accrues to the detriment of others.

And here the questions present themselves—in the name of what love, and how to act? In the name of what love to sacrifice another love, whom to love most, and to whom to do the most good,—to one's own wife and children, or to the wives and children of others? How to serve one's beloved country without infringing upon one's love for one's wife and children and friends?

How, in short, to decide the question as to how much I can sacrifice my own personality which is necessary for the service of others? How much care may I take of myself, in order to be able, since I love others, to serve them? All these problems seem very simple to people who do not know how to account to themselves for that feeling which they call love; but they are not only not simple—but they are absolutely insoluble.

And not without a reason did the publican put to Christ this same question: "Who is my neighbor?" The answer to these questions seems very easy only to those

people who have forgotten the present conditions of human life.

Only in case men were gods, as we imagine them, could they love merely chosen people; then only could the preference of some over others be true love. But men are not gods, and find themselves subject to conditions of existence under which all living beings always live upon each other, devouring each other, both in a direct and in a figurative sense; and man, as a reasonable being, must know and see this. He must know that every happiness of the flesh is received by one being only at the expense of another.

However much religious and scientific superstitions may assure men of some future golden age, in which everybody will have enough of everything, the rational man sees and knows that the law of this temporal existence in space is the struggle of all against each, and of each against each and against all.

In the pressure and conflict of animal interests which constitute life, it is impossible for men to love selected individuals, as those people who do not understand life imagine. Man, if he loves even selected individuals, can never love more than one. Every man loves his mother, and his wife, and his child, and his friends, and his country, and even all men. And love is not a word only (as all are agreed that it is), but activity directed to the good of others. But this activity does not proceed in any definite order, so that at first the demands of a man's own strong, personal love are the first to present themselves, next the less powerful, and so on. The demands of love present themselves constantly, all at once, without any order. Just now a hungry old man, of whom I am rather fond, comes to me and asks for the food which I am keeping for the supper of my dearly loved children. How can I weigh the demands of a temporary and less powerful love with the future demands of a stronger love?

These same questions were put by the lawyer to Christ: "Who is my neighbor?" In fact, how are we to decide whom it is necessary to serve, and in what

degree ; people or our fatherland ? our fatherland or our friends ? our friends or our own wife ? our wife or our father ? our father or our children ? our children or ourselves ? (In order to be in a condition to serve others when this is necessary.)

For all these are the demands of love, and all are so interwoven with each other that the satisfaction of the demands of some deprives a man of the possibility of satisfying the demands of the others. If I admit that it is possible not to clothe a shivering child because my children will be in want, some day, of the garment which is asked of me, then I need not yield to other demands of love in the name of my future children.

It is precisely the same in relation to love for one's country, for chosen occupations, and for all men. If a man can deny the demands of the very smallest present love, in the name of the very greatest love in the future, is it not clear that such a man, even if he desire this with all his heart, will never be in a condition to weigh in what measure he can refuse the demands of the present in the name of the future, and therefore, not being competent to decide this question, he will always choose that manifestation of love which is agreeable to him, *i.e.* he will act, not in the name of his love, but in the name of his individuality. If a man decides that it is better for him to refrain from the demands of the smallest present love in the name of a future and different manifestation of a greater love, then he deceives either himself or others, and loves no one but himself alone.

There is no love in the future. Love is only activity in the present. And the man who manifests no love in the present has no love.

The same thing also comes to pass in the conception of life, in those people who have no life. If men were animals without reason they would exist like animals, and would not discuss life ; and their animal existence would be legitimate and happy. It is the same with love ; if men were animals without reason, they would love those whom they do love ; their wolf-cubs, their flock ; and they would not know that they love their

wolf-cubs or their flock, and they would not know that other wolves love their cubs, and other flocks their comrades in the flock, and their love would be that love and that life which are possible on that plane of consciousness upon which they find themselves.

But men are reasoning beings, and they cannot help perceiving that others cherish the same love for their own, and that therefore these feelings of love must come in conflict and produce something not favorable, but quite opposed to the conception of love.

But if men employ their reason in justifying and strengthening that animal and ill-disposed sentiment which they call love, communicating to that sentiment monstrous proportions, then that sentiment becomes not only the reverse of good, but it makes of man—a truth long since established—the most malign and terrible of animals. That takes place which is described in the Gospels: “If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!” If there were nothing in man except love for himself and his children, there would not be even ninety-nine hundredths of the evil that now exists among men. Ninety-nine per cent of the evil among men springs from that false feeling which they, lauding it, call love, and which is as much like love as the life of the animal is like the life of man.

What people who do not understand life call love is only the familiar preference of some conditions of their personal happiness to others. When a man who does not understand life says that he loves his wife or his child or his friend, he merely says that the presence in his life of his wife or his child or his friend heightens the happiness of his individual life.

These preferences bear the same relation to love that existence bears to life. And as existence is called life by the people who do not know what life is, so the preference of some conditions of personal existence to others is called love by the same people.

These feelings—preferences for certain beings, as for example, for one's children, or even for certain occu-

pations, for science, for instance, or for art, — we also call love ; but such feelings of preference, infinitely varied, constitute the whole complication of the visible, tangible, animal life of men, and cannot be called love, because they have not the chief mark of love, — activity, which has for its aim and end, happiness.

The violence of manifestation of these preferences only demonstrates the energy of the animal personality. The violence of preference of some people over others, inaccurately called love, is merely the stock upon which true love, and even its fruits, may be grafted. But as the stock is not the apple tree and does not yield fruit, or gives only bitter fruit, instead of sweet, so passion is not love, and does no good to people, or produces still greater evil. And therefore the much vaunted love for wife and children, as well as for friends, brings the greatest evil to the world, not to mention love for science, for art, for one's country, which is nothing else than a preference, for the time being, of certain conditions of the animal life over others.

CHAPTER XXIII

TRUE LOVE IS THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF THE HAPPINESS OF THE PERSONALITY

TRUE love, then, becomes possible, only on the renunciation of happiness for the animal personality.

The possibility of true love begins only when a man has comprehended that there is no happiness for his animal personality. Only then will all the sap of his life pass into the one ennobling shoot of genuine love, which has already grown stout with all the powers of the trunk of the wild sapling of the animal person. And the doctrine of Christ is the graft for this love, as He Himself said. He said that He, His love, was the one branch which could bring forth fruit, and that every branch which bringeth not forth fruit is cut off.

Only he who has not only understood, but has also

by his life confessed that he who loves his soul loses it, and that he who hates his soul in this world preserves it to life everlasting,—only he understands genuine love.

“And he who loveth father or mother more than Me is unworthy of Me. And he that loveth son or daughter more than Me is unworthy of Me. If ye love them that love you, that is not love; but love your enemies, love them that hate you.”

It is not by love for father, or son, or wife, or friends, or good and amiable people, as it is generally thought, that men renounce their individuality, but only as a result of the recognition of the vain existence of the individual, a recognition of the impossibility of its happiness, and therefore as a result of the renunciation of individual life, that man becomes acquainted with real love, and can really love father, son, wife, children, and friends.

Love is the preference of other beings to one's self, to one's animal personality.

The neglect of the nearest interests of the individual for the attainment of distant aims of the same individual, as is the case with what is generally called love, which has not grown to self-sacrifice, is merely the preference of some beings over others, for one's own individual happiness. True love, before it becomes an active sentiment, must be a certain condition. The beginning of love, its root, is not a burst of feeling, clouding the reason, as is generally imagined, but is that most rational, luminous, and therefore tranquil and joyous state, peculiar to children and to reasonable people.

That state is a state of affection toward all people, which is inherent in children, but which in grown persons arises only on renunciation, and increases only with the degree of renunciation of the happiness of the individuality. How often are we forced to hear the words: “It is all the same to me, I need nothing,” and in connection with these words to see an unloving mien toward men. But let every man try, at least once, at

a moment when he is ill-disposed toward people, to say to himself honestly and from his soul, "It is all the same to me, I need nothing," and, only for a time, to desire nothing for himself, and every man will learn, through this simple, inward experiment, how instantaneously, in proportion to the honesty of his renunciation, all malevolence will disappear, and how, afterward, affection toward all people will gush from his heart, sealed up to that time.

Love is, in truth, a preference of other beings to one's self — surely that is the way we all understand love, and it is impossible to understand it otherwise. The amount of love is the amount of the fraction whose numerator, my partiality, my sympathy for others, is not in my power; but the denominator, my love for myself, can be augmented or diminished by me, to infinity, in proportion to the significance which I attribute to my animal personality. But the judgment of our world concerning love, concerning its grades, is a judgment as to the size of the fraction according to the numerator alone, without regard to the denominator.

Real love always has as its foundation renunciation of individual happiness, and the affection toward all men which arises therefrom. Only upon this universal affection can spring up genuine love for certain people, — one's own relatives or strangers. And such love alone gives the true bliss of life, and solves the apparent contradictions of the animal and the rational consciousness.

Love which has not for its foundation renunciation of individuality, and, as a consequence, affection for all people, is merely the life of the animal, and is subject to the same miseries as, and to even greater miseries and to still greater folly than, life without this fictitious love. The feeling of partiality called love not only does not remove the conflict of existences, does not free an individual from the pursuit of enjoyments, and does not save from death, but merely darkens life still more, embitters the strife, augments the thirst for pleasures for one's self and others, and increases the terror of death for one's self and others.

The man who places his life in the existence of the animal individuality cannot love, because love must seem to him an activity directly opposed to his life. The life of such a man is only in the happiness of his animal existence; but love demands, first of all, the sacrifice of that happiness. Even if a man who does not understand life should sincerely wish to give himself up to the activity of love, he will not be in a condition to do this, until he understands life, and changes his whole relation to it. The man who sets his life in the happiness of his animal person, who increases, during the whole course of his life, the means of his animal happiness, by acquiring wealth and hoarding it, will make others serve his animal happiness, and will distribute that happiness among those individuals who have been most useful to him for the happiness of his personality. But how is he to give up his life, when his life is supported, not by himself, but by other people? And still more difficult will it be for him to choose to which of the persons whom he prefers he shall give the happiness which he has accumulated, and whom he shall serve.

In order to be in a position to give up his life, he must first give away that superfluity which he takes from others for the happiness of his own life; and more than that, he must accomplish the impossible: decide which of the people he is to serve with his life.

Before he will be in a condition to love, that is, to do good, sacrificing himself, he must cease to hate, that is, to do evil, and he must cease to prefer some people to others for the happiness of his personality.

Only for the man who does not acknowledge happiness in individual life, and who does not, therefore, trouble himself about that false happiness and about that affection toward all men proper to man, which is set free in him, is the activity of love, which always satisfies him and others, possible.

The happiness of the life of such a man in love is like the happiness of the plant in the light; and hence, as the plant which is not in the least covered cannot

inquire, and does not inquire, in what direction it is to grow and whether the light is good, whether it must not wait for some other and better light, but takes the only light that exists in the world, and stretches toward it, — thus the man who has renounced individual happiness does not argue about what he must give up of that which he has taken from other people, and to what beloved beings, and whether there is not some better love than the one which makes the demand, but gives himself, his being, to the love which is accessible to him, and which lies before him. Only such love gives full satisfaction to the reasoning nature of man.

CHAPTER XXIV

LOVE IS LOVE ONLY WHEN IT IS THE SACRIFICE OF SELF

AND there is no other love than this, that a man should lay down his life for his friend. Love is love only when it is the sacrifice of one's self. Only when a man gives to another, not merely his time and his strength, but when he spends his body for the beloved object, gives up his life for him, — only this do we all acknowledge as love; and only in such love do we all find happiness, the reward of love. And only in virtue of the fact that there is such love toward men, only in this, does the world stand. A mother who nurses her child gives herself directly, her body, for the nourishment of the children, who, were it not for this, would not be alive. And this is love. Exactly in the same manner does every laborer for the good of others give his body for the nourishment of another, when he exhausts his body with toil, and brings himself nearer to death. And such love is possible only for the man between whom and the possibility of sacrifice of himself and other beings whom he loves there stands no limit to sacrifice. The mother who gives her child to a nurse

cannot love it; a man who acquires and hoards his money cannot love.

"If any man say that he is in the light, and hateth his brother, he is still in darkness. If any man love his brother, that man abideth in the light and there is no deceit in him. But he that hateth his brother dwelleth in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because darkness hath blinded his eyes. Let us love not in word or with the tongue, but in deed and truth. And hereby do we know that we are of the truth, and our hearts are set at rest. Love attaineth such perfection in us that we have boldness in the day of judgment, because we so walk in the world even as He walked. There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear, for in fear there is torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love."

Only such love gives true life to men.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and all thy soul and all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment." And the second is like unto it: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," said the lawyer to Christ. And to this Jesus replied: "Thou hast said rightly, so do," — *i.e.* love God and thy neighbor — and *thou shalt live*.

True love is life itself. "We know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren," says a disciple of Christ. "He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." Only he is alive who loves.

Love, according to the doctrine of Christ, is life itself, but not a senseless, suffering, and perishing life, but a blessed and endless life. And we all know this. Love is not a deduction of the mind, it is not the result of certain activity; but it is itself the joyful activity of the life which encompasses us on all sides, and which we all know in ourselves from the first memories of our childhood to the time when the false teaching of the world veils it in our soul and deprives us of the possibility of testing it.

But love is not a partiality for that which enhances the temporal happiness of man's personality, like love toward selected individuals or objects, but that striving toward the good of that which is within man, which will remain in man after the renunciation of the happiness of the animal individuality.

Who among living people does not know that blissful sensation, — even if but once experienced, and most frequently of all in the earliest childhood, before the soul is yet choked up with all that lie which stifles the life in us, — that blessed feeling of emotion, during which one desires to love everybody, both those near to him, his father, and mother, and brothers, and wicked people, and his enemies, and his dog, and his horse, and a blade of grass; he desires one thing, — that it should be well with everybody, that all should be happy; and still more he desires that he himself may act so that it may be well with all, that he may give himself and his whole life to making others comfortable and happy. And this, and this alone, is that love in which lies the life of man.

This love, in which alone is life, manifests itself in the soul of man as a hardly perceptible, tender shoot, in the midst of the coarse shoots of weeds resembling it, of the various carnal desires of man which we call love. At first, it seems to men, and to the man himself, that this shoot is the one from which must grow that tree in which the birds shall shelter themselves, — and that all the other shoots are the same.

At first, men even prefer the weeds which grow faster, and the only shoot of life is stifled and languishes; but what is even worse is that which most frequently happens: men have heard that among the number of these shoots there is one which is genuine, life-giving, called love, and, trampling it down, they begin to rear another shoot from the weeds, calling it love.

But, what is still worse, men seize the shoot with rough hands and cry: "Here it is, we have found it; now we know it, let us train it up; love, love! the most elevated sentiment; here it is!" and men begin to trans-

plant it, to correct it, and they grasp it, and tread it under foot, until the shoot dies before it has flowered, and these same men or others say: "All this is nonsense, folly, sentimentality."

The shoot of love, when it appears, is tender, it does not bear handling; it is powerful only when it has attained its growth. All that men do to it is but the worse for it. It needs but one thing, — that men should not hide from it the sun of reason, which alone will promote its growth.

CHAPTER XXV

MEN'S EFFORTS, DIRECTED TO THE IMPOSSIBLE AMELIORATION OF THEIR EXISTENCE, DEPRIVE THEM OF THE POSSIBILITY OF THE ONE TRUE LIFE

ONLY the knowledge of the visionary and delusive character of the animal existence, and the setting free within him of the one true life of love, confers happiness upon man. And what steps do men take for the attainment of this happiness? Men, whose existence consists in the gradual annihilation of personality, and in the approach of that personality to inevitable death, and who cannot fail to be aware of this, strive in every way, during the whole period of their existence, to establish that perishing existence, to gratify its desires, and thereby to deprive themselves of the possibility of the only happiness in life — love.

The activity of men who do not understand life is directed, during the entire period of its existence, to a conflict for their own existence, to the acquisition of enjoyments, to emancipating themselves from suffering, and to putting away from them inevitable death.

But the increase of enjoyment increases the strain of the conflict, the sensitiveness to suffering, and brings death nearer. In order to hide from himself the approach of death, there is but one means: still further to augment pleasure. But the augmentation of pleasures

reaches its limits, pleasure cannot be further increased, it passes into suffering, and remains only in the form of sensitiveness to suffering and terror before death, which is approaching ever nearer and nearer in the midst of suffering alone. And a vicious circle makes its appearance: one is the cause of the other and one augments the other. The chief horror in the life of people who do not understand life lies in the fact that what they regard as pleasures (all pleasures of a rich life), being of such a nature that they cannot be shared equally among all men, must be taken from others, must be obtained by force, by evil, by annihilating the possibility of that kindly inclination toward people from which springs love. So that pleasure is always directly opposed to love, and the stronger it is, the more opposed is it. So that, the stronger, the more intense the activity for the attainment of pleasure, the more impossible becomes the only happiness accessible to man — love.

Life is understood, not as it is recognized by the rational consciousness — as an invisible but undoubted submission at every moment of one's animal nature to the law of reason, setting free the affection toward all people which is proper to man, and the activity of love which flows from it, but only as an existence in the flesh during a certain period of time under settled conditions arranged by us, which exclude the possibility of kindness to all men.

To people of the doctrine of the world, who bend their minds to the organization of fixed conditions of existence, it seems that the augmentation of the happiness of life proceeds from the best external arrangement of one's existence. But the best external arrangement depends upon the exercise of greater violence over men, which is directly opposed to love. So that the better their organization, the less possibility of love, the less possibility of life, is there left to them.

Having applied their reason, not to understanding that identical happiness for all men of the animal existence is equal to a cipher, men have recognized this cipher as a quantity which can be augmented or diminished, and

in this supposititious augmentation and diminution of the cipher they use all the reason which remains unapplied in them.

Men do not perceive that nothing, however much it may be multiplied, remains the same to every other person a cipher; they do not perceive that the existence of the animal personality of every man is equally wretched, and cannot be rendered happy by any external conditions. Men do not wish to see that no one existence, in the flesh, can be happier than any other, that this is as much a law as that whereby the water on the surface of a lake can nowhere rise higher than the general level. Men who have perverted their understanding do not see this, and apply themselves to this impossible work, and in this elevation of the water in various places above the level of the lake—after the manner of what is done by children bathing, who call it “brewing beer”—passes the whole of their existence.

It seems to them that the lives of men are more or less happy and good; the existence of a poor laborer or of a sickly man, they say, is evil, unhappy; the existence of a rich or a healthy man is good and happy; and they bend all the strength of their minds to escaping an evil, unhappy, poor, and sickly existence, and in constructing for themselves a good, rich, healthy, and happy one.

They work out for generations the processes for organizing and maintaining these various and happiest of lives, and hand down the programmes of these fancied better lives, as they call their animal existence, to their descendants. Men vie with each other in endeavoring to maintain as well as possible that happy *life* which they have inherited from the organization of their parents, or to organize for themselves a new and still happier *life*. It seems to men that, by maintaining the order of existence which they have inherited, or by establishing a new one which is better, as they imagine, they are accomplishing something.

And thus upholding each other in this delusion, men often become so sincerely convinced that this senseless

beating of the water, the absurdity of which is evident to themselves, constitutes life—they become so convinced of this, that they turn away with scorn from the summons to true life, which they hear incessantly: both in the teaching of the truth, and the examples of life presented by people who are alive, and in their own suppressed hearts, in which, even to the end, the voice of reason and of love is never stifled.

A wonderful thing takes place. Men, vast numbers of men, who possess the possibility of a life of love and reason, find themselves in the position of those sheep who are being dragged out of a burning house, while they, imagining that people want to fling them into the fire, exert all their strength to contend with those who are trying to save them.

Through fear of death, men do not wish to escape from it; through fear of suffering, men torture themselves, and deprive themselves of the only happiness and life that are possible for them.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE FEAR OF DEATH IS ONLY A CONFESSION OF THE UNSOLVED CONTRADICTION OF LIFE

“THERE is no death,” the voice of truth says to men. “I am the Resurrection and the Life; he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And every one that liveth and believeth in Me shall never die. Believest thou this?”

“There is no death,” say all the great teachers of the world; and the same say millions of men who understand life, and bear witness to it with their lives. And every living man feels the same thing in his soul, at the moment when his consciousness clears up. But men who do not understand life cannot do otherwise than fear death. They see it, and believe in it.

“How is there no death?” cry these people in wrath and indignation. “This is sophistry! Death is before

us; it has mowed down millions, and it will mow us down as well. And you may say as much as you please that it does not exist, it will remain all the same. Yonder it is!"

And they see that of which they speak, as a man mentally afflicted sees the vision which terrifies him. He cannot handle the vision, it has never touched him; of its intentions he knows nothing; but he is afraid, and he suffers from this imaginary vision, which is deprived of the possibility of life. And it is the same with death. Man does not know his death, and never can know it; it has never yet touched him; of its intentions he knows nothing. Then what is it that he fears?

"It has never yet seized me, but it will seize me, that I surely know—it will seize me and annihilate me. And that is terrible," say men who do not understand life.

If men with false ideas of life could reason calmly, and think accurately, on the basis of that conception which they have of life, they would be forced to the conclusion that in what is produced in my fleshly existence by the change which I see proceeding, incessantly, in all beings, and which I call death, there is nothing disagreeable or terrible.

I shall die. What is there terrible about that? How many different changes have taken place, and are now in progress, in my fleshly existence, and I have not feared them? Why should I fear this change which has not yet come, and in which there is not only nothing repulsive to my reason and experience, but which is so comprehensible, so familiar, and so natural for me, that during the whole course of my life I have formed fancies, I still form them, in which the death, both of animals and of people, has been accepted by me as a necessary and often an agreeable condition of life. What is there terrible about it?

For there are but two strictly logical views of life: one false—that by which life is understood as those seeming phenomena which take place in my body from my birth to my death; and another, the true one—by

which life is understood as that invisible consciousness of it which I bear within myself. One view is false, the other is true; but both are logical, and men may hold either the one or the other; but in neither the one nor the other is the fear of death possible.

The first false view, which understands life as the visible phenomena in the body from birth to death, is as old as the world itself. This is not, as many think, a view of life which has been worked out by the materialistic science and philosophy of our day; the science and philosophy of our times have only carried this view to its extreme limits, by which it becomes more visible than hitherto how little this view corresponds to the fundamental demands of human life; but this is the ancient and primitive view of men who stood upon the lower steps of culture. It is expressed among the Chinese, among the Greeks, and among the Hebrews, in the Book of Job, and in the sentence: "Dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return."

This view, in its present expression, runs as follows: Life is the fortuitous play of forces in matter, manifesting itself in space and time. And what we call our consciousness is not life, but a certain delusion of the feelings, which makes it appear that life lies in this consciousness. Consciousness is the spark which flashes up from matter under certain conditions of the latter. This spark flashes up, burns, again grows feeble, and finally goes out. This spark, that is to say, consciousness, experienced by matter in the course of a certain time, between two endless spaces of time, is nothing. And in spite of the fact that consciousness sees and passes judgment on itself and on all the infinite world, and beholds all the play of chance of this world, — and *chief of all*, in the contradistinction to something that is not accidental, calls this play accidental, — this consciousness itself is only the product of dead matter, a specter, appearing and disappearing without any trace or reason. All is the product of matter, infinitely varied; and what is called life is only a certain condition of dead matter.

Such is one view of life. This view is utterly false. According to this view, the rational consciousness of man is merely an accident, accompanying a certain condition of matter; and therefore, what we, in our consciousness, call life, is a phantom. What is dead alone exists. What we call life is the play of death. With such a view of life, death should not only not be terrible, but life ought to be terrible, as something unnatural and senseless, as it is among the Buddhists, and the new pessimists, Schopenhauer and Hartmann.

The other view of life is as follows. Life is only that which I recognize in myself. But I am always conscious of my life, not as I have been or as I shall be (thus I meditate upon my life), but I am conscious of my life thus—that I am—that I never begin anywhere, that I shall never end anywhere. No comprehension of time and space is connected with my consciousness of life. My life is manifested in time, in space, but this is merely its manifestation. But the life itself of which I am conscious makes itself perceptible to me outside of time and space; so that, according to this view, it appears, on the contrary, not that the consciousness of life is a phantom, but all that which is dependent upon space and is visionary in time.

And, therefore, a curtailment of the bodily existence, so far as connected with time and space, has nothing wretched about it, according to this view, and can neither shorten nor destroy my true life. And, according to this view, death does not exist.

There could be no fear of death according to either view of life, if men held strictly to either the one or the other.

Neither as an animal nor as a rational being can man fear death. As the animal has no consciousness of life, it does not see death; but the rational being, having a consciousness of life, cannot see in the death of the animal anything except a natural and never ending movement of matter. But if man fears, what he fears is not death, which he does not know, but life, which alone he does know, and his animal and rational exis-

tence. That feeling which is expressed in men by the fear of death is only the consciousness of the inward contradiction of life ; just as the fear of ghosts is merely a consciousness of a sickly mental condition.

"I shall cease to be; I shall die; all that which I value in life will die," says one voice to a man.

"I am," says another voice; "and I cannot die, and I ought not to die. I ought not to die, and I am dying."

Not in death, but in this contradiction lies the cause of that terror which seizes upon a man at the thought of death of the flesh: the fear of death lies not in the fact that man dreads the curtailment of his animal existence, but in the fact that it seems to him that that will die which cannot and must not die. The thought of future death is only a transference to the future of the death which takes place in the present. The specter which presents itself of a future death of the flesh is not an awakening of the thought of death, but, on the contrary, an awakening of the thought of the life which a man should have and which he has not.

This feeling is similar to that which a man would experience on awaking to life in his grave, underground. "There is life, but I am in death; and this is it—death!" He imagines that what is and must be will be annihilated. And the mind of man mourns and grows afraid. The best proof of the fact that the fear of death is not the fear of death, but of false life, is this, that men frequently kill themselves from the fear of death.

Men are not terrified by the thought of the death of the flesh because they are afraid that their life will end with it, but because the death of the flesh plainly demonstrates to them the necessity of a true life, which they do not possess. And this is why people who do not understand life are so disinclined to think of death. To think of death is exactly the same with them as to confess that they are not living as their rational consciousness demands.

People who fear death, fear it because it represents emptiness and darkness to them; but they behold emptiness and darkness because they do not see life.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE DEATH OF THE FLESH ANNIHILATES THE BODY WHICH BELONGS TO SPACE AND THE CONSCIOUSNESS WHICH BELONGS TO TIME, BUT IT CANNOT ANNIHILATE THAT WHICH CONSTITUTES THE FOUNDATION OF LIFE : THE SPECIAL RELATION OF EVERY CREATURE TO THE WORLD

BUT if men who do not see life would only approach nearer to the phantoms which alarm them, and would examine them, they would perceive that for them also they are only phantoms, and not realities.

The fear of death always proceeds, in these people, from the fear of losing, at their death in the flesh, their special *ego*, which, they feel, constitutes their life. I shall die, my body will molder and destroy my *ego*. But my *ego* is that which has lived in my body so many years.

Men prize this *ego* of theirs ; and, assuming that this *ego* corresponds with their fleshly life, they draw the deduction that it must be annihilated with the destruction of their fleshly life.

This is a very common deduction, and it rarely enters any one's head to doubt it, yet, nevertheless, this deduction is entirely arbitrary. Men — both those who consider themselves materialists, and those who regard themselves as spiritualists — have become so habituated to the notion that their *ego* is the consciousness of their body, which has lived so many years, that it never enters their heads to verify the authenticity of such a conviction.

I have lived fifty-nine years, and during the whole of that time I have been conscious of myself in my body, and this consciousness of myself has, as it seems to me, been my life. But, as a matter of fact, it only seems so to me. I have lived neither fifty-nine years, nor fifty-nine thousand years, nor fifty-nine seconds. Neither my body nor the length of its existence in any way determines the life of

my *ego*. If I, at every moment of my life, ask myself in my own consciousness, "What am I?" I reply: "Something thinking and feeling," *i.e.* bearing itself to the world in its own entirely peculiar fashion.

Only this *ego* do I recognize as my *ego*, and nothing more. As to when and where I was born, when and where I began to think and to feel as I now think and feel, I know absolutely nothing. My consciousness merely says to me: "I am; I am with that relation of mine to the world in which I find myself at the present moment."

Of my birth, my childhood, of many periods of youth, of middle age, of times not very far past, I often remember nothing at all. But if I do recall anything, or if I am reminded of something in my past, then I remember it—and remember it almost exactly as those things which are told me about others.

On what foundation, therefore, do I assert that, during the whole course of my existence, I have been but *one ego*? My body, assuredly, never has been and is not one: my body has always been, and is ceaselessly wasting substance—through something immaterial and invisible, that recognizes this which flows through it as its body. My whole body has been changed scores of times; nothing has been left of the old: muscles and inward parts, and bones, and brain,—all have undergone a change.

My body is one only because there is something immaterial which acknowledges this changing body as one and its own. This immaterial something is that which we call consciousness: it alone holds the whole body together, and recognizes it as one and its own. Without this knowledge of myself as separate from everything else, I should know nothing of my own or of any other life. And therefore, on first thinking the matter over, it appears that the foundation of all—consciousness—must be constant. But this also is incorrect; and consciousness is not constant. During our whole life, and even now, there is repeated that phenomenon of sleep, which seems to us very simple because we all sleep every

day, but which is decidedly incomprehensible, if we admit, what it is impossible not to admit, that consciousness is often entirely suspended during sleep.

Every twenty-four hours, during the period of profound slumber, consciousness is entirely suspended, and is afterward resumed. But, in the meantime, this same consciousness is the only basis upon which the whole body is held together, and recognized as its own. It would seem as though, on the suspension of consciousness, the body should fall apart, and lose its independent existence; but this does not happen either in natural or artificial sleep.

But not only is the consciousness which binds the whole body together periodically interrupted, without the body falling apart, — this consciousness, in addition, changes like the body. As there is nothing in common with my body of ten years ago and my present body, — as it is not one and the same body, so there has not been one consciousness in me. My consciousness as a child three years of age, and my present consciousness, are as different as is the matter of my body now from what it was thirty years ago. Consciousness is not a unit, and there is a series of successive states of consciousness which might be subdivided to infinity.

So even that consciousness which holds the whole body together, and recognizes it as its own, is not a unit, but something which is suspended and which undergoes change. Consciousness, a single consciousness of one's self, as we generally imagine it, does not exist in man, just as there is not one body. There is in man neither one and the same body nor one of that thing which sets apart this body from every other — there is no consciousness which is constantly the same, throughout the whole life of a man, but there is only a series of successive states of consciousness, in some manner united — and, nevertheless, man feels himself to be himself.

Our body is not one, and that which recognizes this changing body to be one and ours is not continuous in point of time, but is merely a series of changing states

of consciousness, and we have already lost both our body and our consciousness many times; we lose our body constantly, and we lose our consciousness every day, when we fall asleep; and every day and hour we feel in ourselves the alteration of this consciousness, and we do not fear it in the least.

Hence, if there is any such thing as our *ego*, which we are afraid of losing at death, then that *ego* cannot reside in the body which we call ours, nor in that consciousness which we call ours for a certain time, but in some other, whole series of successive states of consciousness united into one.

What is this something which binds in one all the states of consciousness which succeed each other in point of time? What is my same radical and peculiar *ego*, which is not composed of the substance of my body and of the series of states of consciousness which proceed in it, but that fundamental *ego* upon which as upon a cord are strung, one after the other, the various consciousnesses which follow each other in point of time? The question seems very profound and wise, but there is not a child who would not know how to answer it, and who would not utter the response twenty times a day.

“But *I* love this and *I* don’t love that.”

These words are very simple, but in them lies the solution of the question as to the peculiar *I* which binds all consciousness in one. It is that *I* which loves this thing and does not love that. Why one loves this and does not love that, no one knows, and, at the same time, it is this very thing which constitutes the foundation of life for every man, and it is this which binds in one all the states of consciousness, varying in point of time, of every individual man.

The external world acts upon all men alike, but the impressions of men, even when under the very same conditions, differ infinitely, both in the number received and in their capacity for being infinitely subdivided, and in their strength. From these impressions is formed the series of successive states of consciousness of every

man. But all these successive consciousnesses are connected only because, even in the present, some impressions act, and others do not act, upon his consciousness. But certain impressions act or fail to act upon a man only because he loves this more or less, and does not love that.

Only in consequence of this greater or lesser degree of love is a certain series of some judgments, and not of others, formed. So that only in the property of loving one more or less, and not loving the other, lies that peculiar and fundamental *ego* of man, in which all the scattered and fragmentary senses are united. And this property, although it is developed in our life, is borne by us, all ready prepared, into this life, from some past invisible and unknown to us.

This peculiar property of men, of loving one thing in a greater or less degree and not loving another, is usually called character. And by this word the peculiar qualities of each individual man, which have taken form in consequence of certain conditions of place and time, are often understood. But this is an error.

The fundamental quality of man, of loving one thing more or less and not loving another, does not proceed from conditions of time and space, but, on the contrary, conditions of time and place act or do not act upon a man only because man, on his entrance into the world, already has a very well-defined property of loving one and not loving another. Only from this cause does it happen that men, born and reared in identical conditions of time and space, often present the sharpest contrast in their internal *ego*.

That which unites in one all the scattered states of consciousness, which, in their turn, bind our body in one, is a very definite thing, although independent of conditions of time and place, and is brought into the world by us from the realm of the spaceless and the timeless: it is that *something* which lies in my well-known exceptional relations to the world, and is my genuine and acting *ego*. I understand myself as that fundamental quality; and other men, if I know them, I

know only as some peculiar relations to the world. On entering into serious spiritual communion with men, none of us, surely, is guided by their external marks, but each of us seeks to penetrate into their nature; that is, to understand what is their relation to the world, what they love, and in what degree, and what they do not love.

Every separate being, — a horse, a dog, or a cow, if I know them, and have any spiritual relations with them, I know; not by their external marks, but by that peculiar relation to the world in which each one of them stands — by the fact that each one of them loves and does not love, and in what degree each loves and does not love. If I know the special and various races of animals, then, strictly speaking, I know them, not so much by their external marks, as because each one of them — the lion, the fish, the spider — presents a general peculiar relation to the world. All lions, as a rule, love one thing, and all fish another, and all spiders a third; only because they love differently are they distinguished in my imagination as different living creatures.

But what I do not yet distinguish in each of these creatures, his special relation to the world, does not prove that it has not existed, but only that the peculiar relation to the world which constitutes the life of a single individual spider is remote from that relation to the world in which I find myself, and that therefore I have not yet understood him as Silvio Pellico understood his individual spider.

The basis of all I know about myself, and about all the world, is that peculiar relation to the world in which I find myself, and in consequence of which I see other beings, who are in their own peculiar relations to the world. But my special relation to the world has not been settled in this life, and did not begin with this body, nor with the series of consciousnesses which have followed each other in point of time.

And, therefore, my body, bound in one by my temporal senses, may be annihilated, and even my temporal existence may be annihilated, but that which cannot be

annihilated is my peculiar relation to the world, which constitutes my peculiar *ego*, from which has been created for me all that is. It cannot be annihilated, because it alone has existence. If it did not exist, I should not know the series of my consecutive states of consciousness, I should not know my body, I should not know my own life or any other. And, therefore, the annihilation of the body and the senses cannot serve as a sign of the annihilation of myself and judgment, cannot serve as a sign of the destruction of my peculiar relations to the world, which neither began nor arose in this life.

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE FEAR OF DEATH ARISES FROM THE FACT THAT MEN
ACCEPT AS LIFE ONE SMALL PORTION OF IT LIMITED
BY THEIR OWN FALSE IDEA

WE are afraid of losing, at the death of the flesh, our special *ego*, uniting the body and a series of conscious states, which manifest themselves temporally, into one; but, nevertheless, this, my peculiar *ego*, did not begin with my birth, and, therefore, the suspension of a certain temporary consciousness cannot annihilate that which unites in one all temporal states of consciousness.

The death of the flesh actually does destroy that which holds the body together, — the consciousness of temporal life. But this happens with us invariably, and every day when we fall asleep. The question lies here: does the death of the flesh destroy that which unites all the consecutive states of consciousness into one, that is to say, my special relation to the world? In order to verify this, it is necessary first to demonstrate that this special relation to the world, which unites in one all succeeding states of consciousness, was born with my birth in the flesh, and that it will, therefore, die with it. But this is not so.

Reasoning upon the foundation of my consciousness,

I see that what binds all my states of consciousness into one is a certain susceptibility toward one thing, and a coldness toward another, in consequence of which one remains, while the other disappears in me, the degree of my love for good and of my hatred for evil, — that is, my peculiar relation to the world, which constitutes me, my special *me*, is not the result of any external cause, but is the fundamental cause of all the other phenomena of my life.

Reasoning upon the foundation of observation, it seems to me at first that the causes of peculiarity in my *ego* are to be found in the peculiarities of my parents, and in the conditions which have influenced them and me; but, on proceeding further in this path of reasoning, I cannot fail to perceive that if my special *ego* lies in the peculiarities of my parents, and the conditions which have affected them, then it lies also in the peculiarities of all my ancestors, and in the conditions of their existence, so that my special *ego* has been produced outside the limits of all space, and outside of all time; that is, that it is the very thing which I recognize it to be.

In this, and only in this timeless and spaceless foundation of my special relation to the world, uniting all the states of consciousness within my memory, and all those states which preceded memory, of my life (as Plato puts it, and as we all feel it in our lives), in this foundation, in my special relation to the world, is there that special *ego*, as to which we fear that it will be annihilated at the death of the flesh.

But it is merely necessary to understand that what unites all states of consciousness in one, that what constitutes the special *ego* of a man, is to be found independent of time, that it always has been and is, and that what can suspend itself is only a series of states of consciousness, within a given time, — in order to make it clear that the destruction of the last state of consciousness in point of time, at the death of the flesh, can as little destroy man's true *ego* as his daily slumber. For no man ever feared to fall asleep, although in sleep

precisely the same thing takes place as at death, namely, a temporary suspension of consciousness. But not a single man is afraid of going to sleep, although the suspension of consciousness is precisely the same as in death, — not because he has reasoned it out that he has gone to sleep and waked again, and that therefore he will wake again (this reasoning is inaccurate: he might wake a thousand times and not waken on the thousand and first); — no one ever goes through this reasoning, and this reasoning could not reassure him; but the man knows that his real *ego* lives independent of time, and that therefore the suspensions of his consciousness which manifest themselves in time cannot destroy his life.

If a man were to fall asleep, as in the fairy tales, for a thousand years, he would go to sleep as tranquilly as for two hours. For consciousness, which is not temporary, but of true life, a break of a million years and of eight hours are all the same, because, for such a life, time does not exist.

The body is annihilated, the consciousness of to-day is annihilated.

But it is surely time for man to become accustomed to the changes of his body, and to the replacement of temporary states of consciousness by others. For these changes began as long ago as man can remember himself, and have proceeded uninterruptedly. Man does not fear the change in his body, and not only is he not terrified, but he often desires to hasten these changes, he desires to grow up, to become a man, to recover health. The person has been a red piece of flesh, and all his consciousness has consisted in the demands of the stomach; now he is a bearded, sensible man, or a woman loving her grown-up children!....

For there is nothing similar either in body or mind, and man has not been terrified by these changes which have brought him to his present condition, but he has only welcomed them. What is there terrible about the impending change? Annihilation? Why, that in which all these changes are effected — a special relation

to the world — that in which consists the consciousness of the true life, did not begin with the birth of the body, but independently of the body and independently of time. Then how can any change connected with time and space destroy that which is not connected with it? A man fixes his eyes upon a small, insignificant bit of his life, does not wish to see all of it, and trembles lest this tiny fragment which is dear to him should be lost. This recalls the anecdote of the madman who imagined that he was made of glass, and who, when he was thrown down, said, "Smash!" and immediately died. In order that a man may have life, he must take the whole of it, and not that small scrap of it which reveals itself in time and space. To him that taketh the whole of life there shall be added, but from him that taketh a portion of it shall be taken away even that which he hath.

CHAPTER XXIX

LIFE IS A RELATION TO THE WORLD. THE MOVEMENT OF LIFE IS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW, A HIGHER, RELATION, AND THEREFORE DEATH IS THE ENTRANCE UPON A NEW RELATION

WE cannot understand life otherwise than as a certain relation to the world: thus do we understand life in ourselves, and thus do we understand it in other beings.

But we understand life in ourselves not only as a relation to the world once existing, but as the establishment of a new relation to the world through greater and ever greater subjection of the animal personality to the reason, and the appearance of a greater degree of love. The inevitable destruction of fleshly existence, which we see in ourselves, proves to us that the relation in which we stand to the world is not permanent, but that we are compelled to establish another. The establishment of this new relation, *i.e.* the movement of life, also destroys the conception of death. The idea of death presents itself only to the man who has not recognized his life as

lying in the establishment of a rational relation to the world, and its manifestation in ever increasing love, and who has remained in this relation, *i.e.* in that degree of love to one thing and dislike to another, with which he entered upon existence.

Life is an unceasing movement, but by remaining in the same relation to the world, by remaining in the same degree of love, with which he entered life, he feels its cessation, and death presents itself to him.

And death is visible and terrible to such a man only. The whole existence of such a man is one constant death. Death is visible and terrible to him, not only in the future, but in the present, at all manifestations of the diminution of animal life, from youth to old age; because the movement of existence from childhood to manhood only seems like a temporary augmentation of strength, while it is, in reality, merely a hardening of the limbs, a decrease of flexibility, of vitality, which never ceases from birth to death. Such a man beholds death constantly before him, and cannot save himself from it by any means whatever. The situation of such a man becomes worse and worse with every day and hour, and nothing can improve it. His special relation to the world, love to one and lack of love for another, seems to such a man only one of the conditions of his existence; and the only business of life, the establishment of a new relation to the world, the increase of love, appears to him as a useless matter. His whole life is passed in the impossible effort to escape from the inevitable diminution of life, the hardening and weakening of it through old age and death.

But it is not thus for the man who understands life. Such a man knows that he brought his peculiar relation to the world into his present life, his love for one and his dislike for the other, from his past, which is concealed from him. He knows that this love of his to one and dislike to another, which has been brought into his existence by himself, is the very essence of his life; that this is not an accidental property of his life, but that this alone possesses the movement of life — and he places

his life in this movement alone, in the augmentation of love.

Looking at his past in this life, he perceives, from the series of the conscious states which he understands, that his relation to the world has changed, that his submission to the law of reason has increased, and that the strength and scope of his love have constantly grown — giving him ever more and more happiness, independent of and sometimes directly contrary to it in proportion to the decrease of the personal existence.

Such a man, having received his life from a past that is invisible to him, and recognizing its constant and unbroken growth, transfers it also to the unseen future, not only calmly, but also joyfully.

It is said: sickness, old age, infirmity, relapse into childhood, are annihilation of the consciousness and of the life of man.

For what sort of man?

I imagine to myself, according to tradition, John the Divine fallen into childishness from old age. According to tradition, he merely said: "Brethren, love one another." The old man of a hundred years, who can hardly move, mumbles, with tearful eyes, ever the same words: "Love one another." In such a man the animal existence hardly flickers — it is all devoured by new relations to the world, by a new existence which has not yet succeeded in establishing itself in the fleshly man.

For a man who understands life as lying in that in which it really does lie, to speak of the decrease of his life in sickness and old age, and to grieve over this, is the same as though a man, on approaching the light, were to bewail the decrease in his darkness in proportion to the nearness of his approach to the light. And to believe in the destruction of one's life because the body is destroyed is the same as believing that the destruction of the shadow of an object, after that object has stepped into the full light, is a sure sign of the destruction of the body itself. Such conclusions could be drawn only by a man who has gazed so long upon

the shadow alone that he has at last come to imagine that it is the object itself.

But for the man who knows himself, not by his reflection in an existence defined by time and space, but by his growth in a loving relation toward the world, the destruction of the shadow of the conditions of time and space is merely the token of a greater degree of light. The man who, understanding his life as that certain special relation to the world with which he entered into existence, and which has grown in his life by the augmentation of love, believes in his annihilation, is on a level with the man who, being acquainted with the external and visible laws of the world, believes that his mother found him under a cabbage-leaf, and that his body will suddenly fly off somewhere so that nothing will remain of it.

CHAPTER XXX

THE LIFE OF DEAD MEN IS NOT ENDED IN THIS WORLD

BUT even more plain does the superstition about death become, I will not say when looked at from another side, but according to the very constitution of life as we know it. My friend, my brother, has lived precisely like myself, and he has now ceased to live like me. His life has been his consciousness, and it has been passed under the conditions of his bodily existence; that is to say, there is no place or time for the manifestation of his consciousness, and he does not exist for me. My brother has been, I have had relations with him, but now he is not, and I shall never know where he is.

"All bonds between him and us are broken. He does not exist for us, and, in like manner, we shall not exist for those who remain behind. What is this if not death?" So speak the people who do not understand life.

These people see, in a visible suspension of external communication, an indubitable proof of actual death.

But on no occasion does the visionary character of the conception of death more clearly and more visibly disappear than on the suspension of the fleshly existence of people who are near to us. My brother is dead; what has happened? That has happened which is accessible to my observations in time and space; the manifestation of his relation to the world has disappeared from before my eyes, and nothing has been left behind.

"Nothing has been left behind," — thus would speak a chrysalis, a cocoon, which had not yet released the butterfly, on seeing that the cocoon lying beside it has been left empty. But the cocoon might say this if it could think and speak, because, on losing its neighbor, it would, in reality, no longer feel it in any way. It is not thus with man. My brother has died; his cocoon, it is true, has been left empty. I do not see him in the form in which I have hitherto seen him, but his disappearance from my vision has not destroyed my relations to him. I retain, as the expression goes, a remembrance of him.

A remembrance remains, — not a remembrance of his hands, his face, his eyes, but a remembrance of his spiritual form.

What is this remembrance? such a simple and comprehensible word as it seems! The forms of crystals and animals disappear, — no remembrance of them remains among crystals and animals. But I retain a remembrance of my friend and brother. And this remembrance is all the more vivid in proportion as the life of my friend and brother was more in conformity with the law of reason, and in proportion as it revealed itself more greatly in love.

This recollection is not merely a representation, but this recollection is something of a sort which acts on me, and acts precisely as the life of my brother did during the period of his earthly existence. This memory is that same invisible, immaterial atmosphere of his which encompassed his life and acted upon me and upon others during his earthly existence, exactly as it acts upon me after his death. This remembrance de-

mands of me now, after his death, the same that it demanded of me during his lifetime.

And this is not all; this recollection has become more obligatory for me since his death than it was during his life. That force of life which resided in my brother has not only not vanished nor suffered diminution, but has not even remained the same; it has increased, and acts more powerfully upon me than before.

The force of his life after his death in the flesh has the same action as before his death, or an even more powerful one, and acts like every truly living thing.

On what grounds can I, feeling in myself that power of life, precisely what it was during the existence in the flesh of this brother, *i.e.* as his relation to the world, which has elucidated to me my relation to the world, assert that my dead brother has no longer life? I can say that he has quitted that lower relation to the world in which he stood as an animal, and in which I still find myself,—and that is all; I can say that I do not see the new center of relation to the world in which he now stands; but I cannot deny his life, because I am conscious of its power upon me. I have gazed in the reflecting surface upon the way in which a man holds me; the reflecting surface has grown dim. I no longer see how he holds me, but I feel in all my being that he still holds me as before, and hence that he exists.

But this is not all; this life of my dead brother, which is invisible to me, not only acts upon me, but enters into me. His special, living *ego*, his relation to the world, becomes my relation to the world. In the establishment of his relation to the world, he elevates me, as it were, to that step to which he has himself risen, and that succeeding step to which he has already ascended, vanishing from my vision, but drawing me with him, becomes clearer to me, to my special, living *ego*. Thus I am conscious for myself of the life of that brother who has fallen asleep in the death of the flesh, and, therefore, I cannot doubt it. But by observing the action in the world of this life which has disappeared from my sight, I am still more indubitably convinced of the

reality of this life which has passed beyond the reach of my eyes. The man is dead, but his relation to the world continues to act upon men, and not even as during life, but in a vast number of times more powerfully, and this action is heightened, and grows like every living thing, in proportion to its wisdom and love, never ceasing, and knowing no suspension.

Christ died a very long time ago, and His existence in the flesh was brief, and we have a clear idea of His person in the flesh; but the power of His wisely loving life, His relation to the world, and no one else's, acts to the present day upon millions, who receive His relation to the world into themselves, and live accordingly. What is it that acts? What is it that was formerly bound up with the existence of Christ in the flesh, and which constitutes the continuation and the growth of this same life of His? We say that it is not the life of Christ, but its results. And, having uttered these words, utterly destitute of meaning, it seems to us that we have said something clearer and more definite than that this power is the living Christ Himself.

But this is exactly the way in which ants might talk who are clustered about an acorn that has grown up and become an oak; the acorn has sprung up and become an oak, and it tears up the soil with its roots, drops branches, leaves, and fresh acorns; it screens from the light, the rain, completely changes everything that formerly grew around it. "This is not the life of the acorn," say the ants, "but the results of its life, which came to an end when we dragged off the acorn and threw it into a hole."

My brother died yesterday, or a thousand years ago, and the same force of his life which acted during his existence in the flesh continues to act still more powerfully on me and on hundreds, thousands, millions of people, in spite of the fact that the center of the power of his temporary existence in the flesh, which was visible to me, has disappeared from my sight.

What does this mean?

I have seen the light of grass burning before me.

This grass has been extinguished, but the light has only increased; I do not see the cause of this light, I do not know what is burning, but I may infer that the same fire which consumed the grass is now consuming the distant forest, or something else which I cannot see.

But the light is such that I not only see it now, but it alone guides me and gives me life. I live by this light. How can I deny it?

I may think that the power of this life has now another center, invisible to me. But deny it I cannot, because I feel it. I live and move in it. What this center, what this life is in itself, I cannot know — I can guess, if I like guessing, and if I am not afraid of becoming entangled. But if I am in search of a rational comprehension of life, I content myself with the clear and indubitable, and I do not wish to spoil the clear and indubitable by combining with it obscure and arbitrary surmises. It is enough for me to know that all that by which I live has been formed from the life of those who have lived before me, and of men who have died long since, and that, hence, every man who fulfils the law of life, submitting his animal personality to reason, and manifesting the power of love, has lived and does live in other people after the disappearance of his corporeal existence, — in order that the clumsy and alarming superstition of death should never again torment me.

We can also observe this in people who have left behind them a force which continues to act, because these people, having submitted their personality to reason and yielded up their lives to love, could never doubt, and have not doubted, the possibility of the annihilation of life.

In the life of such people we can also find the grounds of their faith in life everlasting; and then penetrating into our own life we can find these grounds in ourselves. Christ said that He would live after the disappearance of the semblance of life. He said this because already, during the period of His corporeal existence, he had

entered upon that true life which cannot end. Already, during the time of his corporeal existence, he lived in the rays of the light from that other center of life, to which he was going, and during his lifetime he saw how the rays of that light illuminated the people about him. The same thing is seen by every man who renounces his personality and lives a rational, loving life.

However contracted may have been the sphere of man's activity, — whether he be Christ or Socrates, a good, obscure, self-sacrificing old man, a youth, a woman, — if he lives, renouncing his personality, for the happiness of others, he already enters here, in this life, upon that new relation to the world which is the business of this life for all men.

The man who has placed his life in subjection to the law of reason, and the manifestation of love, already beholds in this life, on one side, the rays of light from that new center of life toward which he is traveling, and, on the other, the action which this light, passing through him, produces upon those about him. And this gives him an unwavering faith in the impossibility of the decrease of life, in its immortality and in the eternal augmentation of life. It is impossible to receive faith from any one, it is impossible to convince one's self of immortality. In order to have faith in immortality it is necessary that the latter should exist; and in order that the latter should exist, it is necessary to understand one's life in that in which it is immortal. Only he can believe in a future life who has performed his work of life, who has established in that life that new relation to the world which does not, as yet, find a place in the world.

CHAPTER XXXI

THE SUPERSTITION OF DEATH ARISES FROM THIS, THAT
MAN CONFOUNDS HIS DIFFERENT RELATIONS TO THE
WORLD

YES, if we look upon life in its true significance, it becomes difficult even to understand by what the terrible superstition of death is supported.

Thus, if you examine that which has frightened you in the dark as a phantom, you can never again, by any means, revive that visionary fear.

The fear of losing that which alone is, arises only from the fact that life appears to man not only in the relation of his mental consciousness to the world, which is known to him, but invisible, peculiar to him, but also in two relations which are unknown, though visible to him: that of his animal consciousness and that of his body to the world. All that exists presents itself to man: (1) as the relation of his rational consciousness to the world; (2) as the relation of his animal consciousness to the world; and (3) as the relation of the matter of his body to the world. Not understanding that the relation of his rational consciousness to the world is his sole life, man imagines his life as still lying in the relation of his animal consciousness to the world, and he is afraid of losing his special relation of rational consciousness to the world, when in his personality the former relations of his animal person and of the matter which constitutes him, to the world, shall have been destroyed.

To such a man it appears that he proceeds from the movement of matter passing to the stage of a personal animal consciousness. It seems to him that this animal consciousness passes into rational consciousness, and that afterward this rational consciousness grows weak, passes back again into the animal, and that the animal finally weakens and passes into the dead matter from which it was derived.

But the relation of his rational consciousness to the

world seems to him, from this point of view, something accidental, unnecessary, perishable. From this point of view it seems to him that the relation of his animal consciousness to the world cannot perish—that his animal will be continued in his species; that the relation of matter to the world cannot be annihilated in any way, and is eternal; but that the most precious thing—his rational consciousness—is not only not eternal, but is merely a gleam of something unnecessary and superfluous.

And man feels that this cannot be. And therein lies the fear of death. In order to save themselves from this fear, some men try to convince themselves that their animal consciousness is their rational consciousness, and that the immortality of the animal man, that is to say, of his race, satisfies the demand for the immortality of the rational consciousness, which they bear within them. Others try to convince themselves that a life which has never previously existed, which suddenly reveals itself in corporeal form, and vanishes in it, will rise again in the flesh and live. But belief in either is impossible for men who do not recognize life as residing in the relation of the rational sense to the world. It is evident to them that the continuation of the human race does not satisfy the ever recurring demand for the immortality of one's individual *ego*; and the idea of a life which begins again includes in itself an idea of a suspension of life, and if life never existed formerly, has not always existed, then it cannot exist afterward.

For both classes of men, the earthly life is a wave. From dead matter a person is developed, from the person a rational consciousness, the crest of the wave; having risen to their height, the waves, rational consciousness and individuality, fall back in the same place from which they started, and are annihilated. Human life is the visible life for both classes. Man has grown up and matured and died, and after death there can be nothing for him,—that which is after him and from him remains; neither posterity nor its deeds can satisfy him. He pities *himself*, he fears the cessation of *his* life.

That this life of his, which has begun here on earth in his body, and which has here come to an end — that this life will revive again of itself he cannot believe.

Man knows that if he has not existed before, and if he has made his appearance from nothing, and has died, that he, his special person, will never exist longer, and that it cannot exist. Man recognizes the fact that he will not die only when he has recognized the fact that he has never been born, that he always has existed, does exist, and always will exist. Man will believe in his immortality only when he comprehends that his life is not a wave, but is that eternal movement which in this life reveals itself only as a wave.

It seems to me that I shall die, and my life will come to an end, and this thought tortures and frightens me because I am sorry for myself. And what will die? For what do I feel compassion? What am I from the ordinary point of view? First of all, I am flesh. What then? Am I afraid for that, am I sorry for that? It seems not: my body, matter, can never be lost anywhere, not a single particle of it. Hence, this part of me is secure; there is nothing to fear for this part. All will be preserved in its entirety.

But no, people say, that is not what I pity. I pity Lyeff Nikolaevitch, Ivan Semyonitch. But no one is any longer what he was twenty years ago, and every day he is a different person. How then do I pity myself? No, they say, that is not it; I do not pity that. I pity my consciousness, my *ego*.

But this consciousness of yours has not always been one, but it has been several; it was one thing a year ago, it was something still more different ten years ago, and utterly different still earlier. As far back as you can remember, it has kept on changing; does your present consciousness please you so greatly that you are so sorry to lose it?

If it had always been the same in you, then one could understand this; but it has done nothing but change. You do not see and cannot find its beginning, and, all of a sudden, you desire that there shall be no end to it,

that this consciousness now existing in you shall exist forever. You have been moving on ever since you can remember. You came into this life you yourself know not how, but you know that you came as that special *ego* which you are, and then moved on and on until you have reached the half-way point, and, all of a sudden, you do not exactly rejoice or fear, but you have begun to resist, and you do not wish to stir from the spot, because you do not see what there is ahead. But neither did you see the place from which you came; but you came, nevertheless: you have entered at the entrance gate, and you do not wish to go out through the gate of exit.

Your whole life has been a progress through corporeal existence; you have advanced, you have hastened your pace, and all at once you have been seized with pity because that very thing is being accomplished which you have yourself done incessantly. The great change in your position at the death of your body is terrible to you, but the same great change took place with you at your birth, and not only did nothing bad come of it for you, but, on the contrary, so good a thing came of it that you do not wish to part with it.

What can frighten you? You say that you are sorry for yourself, with your present feelings and thoughts, with such views of the world, with your present relations to the world.

You are afraid of losing your present relation to the world. What relation is it? In what does it consist?

If it consists in your eating thus, drinking, reproducing your race, building a dwelling, dressing yourself, bearing yourself this way or that to other people and animals, then this is the relation of every man, as a reasoning animal, to life, and this relation cannot disappear; such have been, and are, and will be millions, and their posterity will be preserved as indubitably as every particle of matter. The instinct for the preservation of their race is inherent in all animals with such force, and therefore in so durable a manner, that there is no occasion to fear for it. If you are an animal, there is noth-

ing for you to fear; and if you are matter, you are still surer of your immortality.

But if you are afraid of losing that which is not animal, you fear to lose your special rational relation to the world—that with which you entered upon this existence: but you know that this did not have its source at your birth; it exists independently of the animal, which is born, and therefore cannot be dependent upon its death.

CHAPTER XXXII

THE VISIBLE LIFE IS A PART OF THE ENDLESS MOVEMENT OF LIFE

My earthly life and the lives of all other men present themselves to me thus:—

I and every living man find ourselves in this world with a certain, well-defined relation to the world, with a certain degree of love. It seems to us at first that our life begins with this relation of ours to the world, but observation of ourselves and others shows us that this relation to the world, and the degree of love of each one of us, did not begin with this life, but were brought into life by us from a past that is concealed from us by our birth in the flesh; moreover, we see that the whole course of our life here is nothing but a never ceasing augmentation, strengthening of our love, which will never come to an end, but will only be veiled from our eyes by the death of the flesh.

Our visible life appears to me like a section of a cone, the apex and base of which are concealed from my mental vision. The narrowest portion of the cone represents my relation to the world, from which I first recognize myself; the widest part is that higher relation to life to which I have now attained. The beginning of this cone, its apex, is concealed from me in time by my birth; the continuation of the cone is hidden from

me, both by my corporeal existence and by my death in the flesh. I see neither the apex of the cone, nor its base; but I recognize its nature without any doubt from that part of it in which my visible life, as it comes within my recollection, passes. It seems to me at first that this section of a cone is the whole of my life; but in proportion to the movement of my true life, I see on one hand that what constitutes the foundation of my life lies behind it, outside of its bounds; according to the measure of my life I feel more clearly and vividly my bond with my past which is visible to me.

On the other hand, I see how this foundation rests upon my future, which is invisible to me. I feel more clearly and vividly my bond with the future, and I come to the conclusion that the life which is visible to me, my earthly life, is but a small portion of my whole life, from both its ends — before birth and after death — undoubtedly existing, but concealed from my present knowledge. And therefore the cessation of the visibility of life, after the death of the flesh, as well as its invisibility before my birth, does not deprive me of the indubitable knowledge of its existence before birth and after death. I enter life with certain ready-prepared qualities of love for the world outside of me; my corporeal existence, short or long, passes in the augmentation of this love, which I brought into life, and hence I conclude, without any doubt, that I lived before my birth, and that I shall live not only after the present moment, in which I now find myself as I meditate, but after every other moment of time, either before or after my corporeal death, as well.

Looking outside of myself at the corporeal beginnings and endings of the existence of other people (even of beings in general), I perceive that one life seems longer, another shorter; one makes its appearance earlier, and continues to be visible to me for a longer time; another makes its appearance later, and is concealed from me again very quickly; but I see in all the revelation of one and the same law, for every true life, — an increase of love, — like the broadening out of the rays of life.

Sooner or later the curtain falls, concealing from me the temporary course of the life of men, but the life of all men is one and the same, and, like every life, it has no beginning and no end. And the fact that a man has lived for a longer or a shorter time in the conditions of this existence which are visible to me cannot present any difference in his true life.

The fact that one man has taken longer to pass across the field which is open to my vision, or that another has passed quickly across it, can by no means cause me to ascribe more reality to the life of the first, or less to the second. I know beyond a doubt that if I have seen a man pass my window, whether fast or slowly, it makes no difference, — I know beyond a doubt that the man existed before the time when I saw him, and that he will continue to exist even when he has disappeared from my sight.

But why do some pass quickly, and others slowly? Why does the old man, dried up and morally hardened, incapable, according to our view, of fulfilling the law of life—the increase in love—live on, while a child, a young man, a maiden, a man in the full strength of his spiritual work, dies, passes beyond the bounds of this fleshly life, when, according to our ideas of the matter, he has only just begun to establish in himself a correct relation to life?

The deaths of Pascal and Gogol are comprehensible; but how about Chenier, Lermontoff, and thousands of other men, who, as it seems to us, had but just begun their inner labor, which might have been, as it seems, completed here?

But this only seems so to us. None of us knows anything about the foundations of life which are brought into the world by another, and about that movement of life which has taken place in him; about those obstacles to the movement of life which exist in that being; and, chief of all of those other conditions of life, possible, but unseen by us, in which, in another existence, the life of that man may be placed.

It seems to us, as we look at the blacksmith's work,

that the horseshoe is completely ready, — that it needs only a couple of blows, — but he breaks it and throws it into the fire again, knowing that it is not thoroughly smelted. We cannot know whether the work of the true life is being accomplished in a man or not. We only know this so far as we ourselves are concerned. It seems to us that a man dies when it is not necessary, but this cannot be so. A man dies only when it is indispensable for his welfare, just as a man grows up and attains to manhood only when that is necessary for his welfare.

And in fact, if by life we mean life and not its semblance, if true life is the foundation of everything, its foundation may depend upon what it produces: — the cause cannot depend upon or proceed from the result, — the course of true life cannot be destroyed by a change in its manifestation. The movement, begun but not completed, of the life of man toward that world, cannot be suspended because he has an abscess, or because bacteria attack him, or because some one shoots him with a pistol.

A man dies only because the happiness of his true life cannot be enhanced, in this world, and not because his lungs pain him, or because he has a cancer, or because a bomb has been thrown at him. It generally appears to us that to live a life in the flesh is natural, and that it is not natural to perish by fire, water, cold, lightning, sickness, a pistol, a bomb; — but it is only necessary to reflect seriously, looking from one side upon the life of men, in order to perceive that, on the contrary, it is quite unnatural for a man to live a corporeal life in the midst of these deadly conditions, in the midst of the wide-spread and, for the most part, deadly and innumerable bacteria. It is natural for him to perish.

And therefore the corporeal existence, in the midst of all these destructive conditions, is, on the contrary, something of the most unnatural sort, in a material sense. If we are alive, it is not in the least because we take care of ourselves, but because we are doing the business of life. The business of life comes to a close,

and nothing can arrest any longer the never ceasing destruction of the animal life of man, — this destruction is accomplished, and one of the most intimate causes which always accompany the life of man, the death of the flesh, seems to us its exclusive cause.

Our true life exists; we know it alone; from it alone we know the animal life, and therefore, if its semblance be subjected to immutable laws, then why should not that which this semblance performs be subject to laws also?

But we are troubled because we do not see the causes and effects of our true life as we see causes and effects in external manifestations: we do not know why one person enters life with such and such properties of his *ego*, and another person with others; why the life of one is broken off, and another continues. We ask ourselves: what, before my existence, were the causes of my being born such as I am? And what will be the result after my death, of my living thus or in some other way? And we complain because we receive no answers to these questions.

But to complain because I cannot now understand much that happened before my life, and that will take place after my death, is the same as complaining because I cannot see what is beyond the limits of my vision.

For if I saw what is beyond the limits of my vision, I should not see what is within its bounds. But for the happiness of my animal, it is more necessary that I should see all that is round about me.

And it is the same with the mind, by means of which I know. If I were able to see what is beyond the range of my intellect, I should not see what is within its range. But for the happiness of my true life, it is more necessary that I should know all that to which I must submit *then* and *now* my animal personality, in order to attain the happiness of life. And my mind reveals this to me, reveals to me in this life that sole path along which I do not perceive a cessation of my happiness.

It demonstrates to me indubitably that this life did not begin with birth, but was and is always; but that happiness always exists, — demonstrates to me that the happiness of this life grows and increases here, attaining to such an extent that it cannot be contained, and only then does it pass beyond those conditions which restrict its augmentation, and pass into another existence.

Reason sets a man upon that sole path of life which, like a cone-shaped, widening tunnel, inclosed in the center on all sides by its close walls, opens to him afar off the indubitable immortality of life and its happiness.

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE INEXPLICABILITY OF THE SUFFERINGS OF THE EARTHLY EXISTENCE PROVES TO MAN, MORE CONVINCINGLY THAN ANYTHING ELSE, THAT HIS LIFE IS NOT A LIFE OF PERSONALITY, WHICH BEGAN AT HIS BIRTH AND WHICH ENDS AT HIS DEATH

BUT even if a man could not help fearing death, or thinking of it, the sufferings alone — fearful, aimless, utterly unjustifiable, never to be averted sufferings — to which he is subject, would be sufficient to destroy every rational idea ascribed to life.

I am engaged in a work for others which is undoubtedly good, and all of a sudden I am seized with an illness, which interrupts my undertaking and exhausts and tortures me, without any sense or reason. A screw has grown rusty on the rails, and it must needs be that on that very day when it flies out, in the very train and carriage, a good woman should be traveling, — a mother, — and it must needs be that her children should be crushed before her very eyes. In an earthquake, precisely that spot sinks on which stands Lisbon or Vyerny, and perfectly innocent people plunge headlong, alive, into the earth, and die in terrible agony. What sense is there in this? Why did this happen to these people, and why

thousands of other senseless, frightful cases of suffering, which astound men?

Argumentative explanations make nothing clear. Argumentative explanations of all such phenomena always dodge the actual question, and only prove the more conclusively its insolubility. I have fallen ill because such and such microbes or other have flown to me; or the children were crushed before their mother's eyes in the train because the dampness had acted in such and such a way on the iron; or Vyerny sank because of the existence of certain geological laws. But the real question is why just these particular people were subjected to such terrible sufferings, and how I am to avoid such accidents or sufferings?

To this there is no answer. Reflection, on the contrary, plainly demonstrates to me that there are no laws according to which one man is subject, but another man is not subject to these accidents, that there is and can be none; that there is an incalculable quantity of such accidents, and therefore that whatever I do, my life is liable every second to all the innumerable chances of the most terrible suffering.

For if people drew only those deductions which inevitably follow from their view of the world, people who understand their life as a personal existence would not remain alive for a minute. Assuredly, not a single laborer would live under a master who, on hiring the laborer, should stipulate for the right, on every occasion when he should see fit, to roast the laborer alive on a slow fire, or to flay him alive, or to pull out his sinews, and in general to commit all those horrors which he perpetrates upon his laborers, in the presence of the man hiring himself, without cause or explanation.

If people really did understand life thoroughly, as they say that they do, not one of them would remain alive in this world, from pure fear of all those torturing and utterly inexplicable sufferings which they see around them, and into which they might fall at any second.

But men, in spite of the fact that they are all acquainted with various easy ways of killing themselves,

of escaping from this life filled with such harsh and inconceivable sufferings, — men live on ; they complain, they weep over the sufferings, and go on living.

It is impossible to say that this arises from the fact that there is more pleasure than suffering in this life, because, in the first place, not only simple reflection, but also philosophical investigations, demonstrate that all earthly life is a series of sufferings, which are far from being redeemed by its enjoyments ; in the second place, we know, both from ourselves and from others, that people in positions which present nothing but a series of increasing sufferings, without any possibility of alleviation except by death itself, do not, nevertheless, kill themselves, but cling to life.

There is but one explanation of this strange contradiction : men all know, in the depths of their own soul, that all sorts of sufferings are always necessary, indispensable to the happiness of their lives, and they only go on living foreseeing them or submitting to them. But they rebel against suffering because, with their false view of life, which demands happiness only for their personality, the interference with that happiness, which does not lead to evident happiness, must appear as something inconceivable, and therefore disturbing.

And people take fright in the face of suffering, they are amazed at it, as though at some utterly unexpected and incomprehensible thing. But, at the same time, every man is reared on sufferings, his whole life is a series of sufferings undergone by him and imposed by him on other beings, and it would seem as though it were time for him to have become accustomed to suffering, and not to quail before it, and not to ask himself why and to what end his sufferings. Every man, if he will but reflect, will see that all his enjoyments are purchased by the sufferings of other beings, that all his sufferings are indispensable for his own enjoyment ; that without suffering there is no enjoyment ; that suffering and enjoyment are two contrary states, one being evoked by the other, and each indispensable to the other.

Then what mean the questions, "Why?" — "To

what end is suffering?" which the reasoning man puts to himself? Why does a man, who knows that suffering is bound up with enjoyment, ask himself, "Why?" — "To what end is suffering?" while he does not ask himself, "Why?" — "To what end are enjoyments?"

The whole life of the animal, and of man as an animal, is an unbroken chain of sufferings. The whole activity of the animal, and of man as an animal, is called forth only by suffering. Suffering is a painful sensation which calls forth activity, that banishes this painful sensation and calls forth a state of pleasure. And the life of the animal, and of man as an animal, is not only not suspended by suffering, but is perfected only by suffering. Suffering, therefore, is that which moves life, and hence it is what it should be; then what does man ask about when he asks: "Why and to what end is suffering?"

The animal does not ask this.

When the perch, in consequence of hunger, torments the dace, when the spider tortures the fly, the wolf the sheep, they know that they are doing what must be, and that they are accomplishing the very thing which must be fulfilled; and therefore when the perch and the spider and the wolf fall into the same torments from those stronger than they, they know, as they flee and resist and wrench themselves away, that they are doing what must be done, and therefore there cannot be the slightest doubt in them that what is happening to them is precisely that which must be so.

But a man, occupied only with the healing of his legs when they have been torn off on the battle-field, upon which he has torn off the legs of others, or occupied only in passing his time as comfortably as possible in his solitary cell in jail, after having directly or indirectly consigned others to that place, or a man who cares only for fighting himself free and fleeing from the wolves, who are rending him, after having himself slain thousands of animals and eaten them, — a man cannot regard what happens to him as what must be, because, in submitting to these sufferings, he did not do all that he

should have done, and therefore it seems to him that something is happening to him which should not be.

But what should a man do, who has been torn by wolves, except flee and fight free from them? — That which it is proper for a man as a rational being to do; confess the sin which has caused suffering, repent of it, and confess the truth.

The animal suffers only in the present, and therefore the activity called forth by the suffering of the animal direct upon itself in the present fully satisfies it. But man suffers not only in the present, but he suffers also in the past, and in the future, and therefore the activity called forth by the sufferings of man, if concentrated only upon the present of the animal man, cannot satisfy him. Only activity directed to the cause as well, and to the results of suffering, both upon the past and upon the future, satisfies the suffering man.

The animal is locked in and tears himself from his cage, or his foot is sore and he licks the spot that pains him, or he devours another and rids himself of him. The law of his life is broken from without, and he concentrates his activity upon restoring it, and he fulfils that which must be. But a man — I myself or some one closely connected with me — is in prison; or I lose my legs, or some one nearly related to me loses his legs in battle, or wolves rend me: the activity devoted to flight from prison, to the healing of my legs, to fighting myself free from wolves, does not satisfy me, because confinement in prison, pain in my leg, and the being torn by wolves, constitute only a very small portion of my suffering.

I perceive the cause of my suffering in the past, in my errors and in the errors of other people, and if my activity is not directed to the cause of the suffering, to the errors, and if I do not try to free myself from it, I do not do that which should be done; and therefore suffering presents itself to me in a way in which it should not, and not only in fact but in imagination does it grow to frightful proportions, which exclude all possibility of life.

The cause of suffering for the animal is the violation of the law of animal life; this violation makes itself known by a consciousness of pain, and the activity called forth by the violation of the law is directed to the removal of the pain; the cause of pain for rational consciousness is the violation of the law of life of rational consciousness; this violation reveals itself in a consciousness of error, of sin, and the activity called forth by the violation of the law is directed to the removal of the error—the sin. And as the suffering of the animal calls forth activity directed to pain, and this activity deprives suffering of its torture, so the sufferings of a rational being call forth activity directed to error, and this activity frees suffering from its torture.

The questions, “Why?” and, “To what purpose?” which make their way into the soul of man, at the experience or the imagination of suffering, only show that man has not recognized that activity which should be called forth in him by suffering, and which frees suffering from its torture. And in fact, for the man who recognizes his life as lying in his animal existence, there can be none of that activity which frees from suffering, and the less so in proportion as he already understands his life.

When a man, who recognizes personal existence as his life, finds the cause of his personal suffering in his personal errors, he understands that he has fallen ill because he has eaten something injurious, or that he has been beaten because he himself went out to fight, or that he is hungry and naked because he would not work,—he knows that he suffers because he has done that which he should not have done, and in order that he may do so no more, and that, directing his activity to the extinction of error, he does not rebel against suffering, but bears it lightly, and often joyously.

But when such a man is attacked by suffering exceeding the bounds of the bond of suffering and error which are visible to him—as when he suffers from causes which have always existed in his own personal activity, or when the results of his suffering can be

in no way advantageous either to himself or to any other person, — it seems to him that he is overtaken by that which should not be, and he asks himself: Why? to what purpose? and, finding no object upon which to direct his activity, he rebels against suffering, and his suffering is converted into terrible torture. But the greater part of man's suffering is always such that its causes or its consequences — sometimes the one, and sometimes the other — are concealed from him in space and time: hereditary diseases, unhappy accidents, bad harvests, collisions, conflagrations, earthquakes, and so on, which end in death.

The explanation that this is necessary in order to furnish a lesson for the people of the future, that they must not yield to those passions which are reflected in the diseases of their descendants, or that they must build trains better, or handle fire with more caution, — all these explanations give me no answer at all. I cannot admit that the significance of my life lies in the illustration of the oversights of other people; my life is my life, with my aspirations for happiness, and not an illustration for other lives. And these explanations are fit only for the purpose of discussion, and do not alleviate that fear in the presence of the senselessness of the sufferings which threaten me, and which exclude all possibility of life.

But even if it were possible to understand in any way that, while causing other people to suffer through my errors, I by my sufferings bear the consequences of other people's errors; if it were possible also to understand even remotely that every suffering is a punishment for an error which must be rectified by men in this life, there still remains a long series of sufferings which are in no way explicable.

Wolves rend a man who is alone in the forest, a man is drowned, frozen, or burned up, or simply falls ill alone and dies, and no one ever knows how he suffered, and there are thousands of such cases. Of what use can this be to any one?

For the man who understands his life as an animal

existence, there is not, and there cannot be, any explanation, because, for such a man, the connection between suffering and error lies only in the manifestations which are visible to him, and this connection is utterly lost from his mental vision in the sufferings which precede death.

A man has two alternatives of choice: either, not recognizing the connection between the sufferings which he has experienced in his life, to continue to endure the greater part of his sufferings as tortures, utterly devoid of reason: or to admit that my errors and the deeds committed in consequence of them—that my sins, whatever they may be—are the cause of my sufferings, and that my sufferings are a release and redemption for my sins, and the sins of other people, whatever may be their nature.

Only these two attitudes toward suffering are possible: one, according to which suffering is that which should not exist, because I do not perceive its external significance; and the other that it is just what it should be, because I know its inward significance for my true life. The first proceeds from the recognition of the happiness of my separate, individual life as happiness. The second proceeds from the recognition as happiness of the happiness of my whole past and future life, in its unbroken connection with the happiness of other men and creatures.

According to the first view there is no explanation for sufferings, and they call forth no other activity than a constantly increasing despair and bitterness, which are not to be alleviated. According to the second, suffering evokes that same activity which constitutes the movement of true life,—a consciousness of sin, a release from error, and submission to the law of reason.

If it is not man's reason, then it is the torture of suffering which forces him, willingly or unwillingly, to confess that his life is not contained in his personality, that his personality is only the visible part of his whole life, that the external bond between cause and effect, visible to him in his personality, does not coincide with that in-

ternal bond of cause and effect which is always known to man through his rational consciousness.

The connection between error and suffering, visible to the animal only under conditions of time and space, is always clear to a man, outside of those conditions in his consciousness. Suffering of any sort, man always recognizes as the result of his sin, whatever it may have been, and repentance for his sins as a release from suffering and the attainment of happiness.

A man's whole life, from the early days of his childhood, consists in this alone: in the acknowledgment, through suffering, of sin, and in the freeing himself from error. I know that I came into this life with a certain knowledge of the truth, and that the greater have been my errors the greater have been my sufferings and the sufferings of others, — that the more I have freed myself from error, the less have been my sufferings, and the more happiness have I attained. And, therefore, I know that the greater the knowledge of the truth which I carry out of this world, and which is given me by my sufferings, even by my last sufferings which precede death, the greater is the happiness that I attain.

The torture of suffering is experienced only by the man who, having separated himself from the life of the world, and not perceiving those sins of his by which he brought his sufferings into the world, regards himself as innocent, and who, therefore, rebels against all those sufferings which he endures for the sins of the world.

And, strange to say, that very thing which is clear to the reason, mentally, is confirmed by the sole and true activity of life, by love. Reason says that a man who confesses the connection of his sins and his sufferings with the sins and sufferings of the world, frees himself from the torture of suffering; love indeed confirms this.

The half of every man's life is passed in sufferings, which he not only does not recognize as torture, and which he does not perceive, but which he regards as his happiness only because they are borne as the results of error, and as a means of alleviating the sufferings of beloved individuals. So that the less love there is, the

more is man subjected to the anguish of suffering; the more love there is, the less acuteness of suffering is there; but a thoroughly rational life, whose entire activity is manifested only in love, excludes the possibility of all suffering. The anguish of suffering is only that pain which men experience on their attempt to break that chain of love to their ancestors, to their descendants, to their contemporaries, which unites the life of a man with the life of the world.

CHAPTER XXXIV

BODILY SUFFERINGS CONSTITUTE AN INDISPENSABLE CONDITION OF THE LIFE AND HAPPINESS OF MEN

"BUT, nevertheless, it is painful, it is corporeally painful. Why this pain?" men ask.

"Because this is not only necessary for us, but because we cannot live without its being painful to us," that man would answer us who has caused our pain, and has rendered it as little painful as possible, and has made as much happiness out of this "pain" as possible.

For who does not know that the very first sensation in us of pain is the first and principal means both of preserving our bodies, and of prolonging our animal life? Bodily pain protects the animal personality. And while pain serves as a protection to the personality, as is the case with the child, pain cannot be that frightful torture, such as we know pain to be, at the times when we are in the full strength of our rational consciousness and resist pain, seeing in it that which it should not be.

Pain in the animal and the child is very well defined and small in size, never attaining that degree of anguish which it reaches in beings endowed with rational consciousness. In the case of the child, we see that he sometimes cries as pitifully from the bite of a flea as from the pain which destroys the internal organs.

And the pain of a being which does not reason leaves no traces whatever in the memory. Let any man en-

deavor to recall his childish sufferings from pain, and he will see that he not only does not remember these, but that he is incapable of even reconstructing them in his imagination. Our impression at the sight of the suffering of children and animals is our suffering more than theirs. The external expression of suffering in unreasoning beings is immeasurably greater than the suffering itself, and hence it evokes our sympathy in a far greater degree, as can be observed in diseases of the brain, in fevers, in typhus, in all cases of death agony.

At those periods when the rational consciousness has not yet been awakened, and pain serves only as a protection to the person, it is not acute; but in those periods when there is in a man a possibility of rational consciousness, it is the means of subjugating the animal personality to the reason, and in proportion to the awakening of that consciousness does it become less and less torturing.

In reality, only when we find ourselves the complete master of our rational consciousness can we talk of sufferings, because only with this condition does life begin, and those conditions of it which we call suffering. And in this condition the sensation of pain can increase to the greatest and shrink to the most insignificant dimensions. Who, in fact, does not know, without studying physiology, that there is a limit to sensibility, that, when pain exceeds a certain point, sensibility either comes to an end in a swoon, insensibility, a fever, or that death supervenes? Hence the augmentation of pain is a very accurately defined quantity, which cannot exceed certain bounds. But the sensation of pain can be infinitely augmented by our relations to it, and in the same way it can be decreased to infinite minuteness.

We all know how a man can, by submitting to pain, by acknowledging it as what must be, reduce it to insensibility, to a sensation of joy, even, in undergoing it.

Not to mention the martyrs, not to mention Huss, who sang in the fire at the stake — simple men, merely out of a desire to exhibit their courage, endure without a cry or a quiver what are considered the most torturing

of operations. There are bounds to the augmentation of pain, but to the diminution of sensation under it there is no limit.

The anguish of pain is really frightful for people who consider their lives as consisting in the existence of the flesh. And how can it fail to be terrible to them when the force of reason bestowed upon man for the annihilation of acute suffering is directed only to its augmentation?

As Plato has a myth relating how God first fixed the period of man's existence at seventy years, but afterward, on perceiving that men were the worse for it, altered it to what it now is, that is to say, arranged it so that men do not know the hour of their death, — just so surely would reason have decided upon the present state of things, the myth narrating how men were first created without sensation of pain, but that afterward it was arranged as it is for their happiness.

If the gods had created men without the feeling of pain, men would very soon have begun to beg for it; women lacking the pains of childbirth would have brought forth children under conditions where but few of them would have remained alive; children and young people would have thoroughly spoiled their whole bodies, and grown people would never have known either the errors of those who had lived before them, and of people now living, nor, what is the most important of all, their own errors, — they would not have known what they must do in this life, they would have had no rational object of existence, they could never have reconciled themselves to the idea of impending death in the flesh, and they would have had no love.

For a man who understands life as a submission of his personality to the law of reason, pain is not only not an evil, but is an indispensable condition both of his animal and of his rational life. Were there no pain, this animal personality would have no indication when it had transgressed its laws; if rational consciousness suffered no pain, man would not know the truth, would not know his own law.

“But you are talking,” people retort to this, “about your personal sufferings, but how can you deny the sufferings of others? The sight of these sufferings constitutes the most acute suffering,” say people not in full sincerity.

The suffering of others? But the sufferings of others—what you call sufferings—have not ceased, and will not cease. The whole world of men and animals suffers, and has never ceased to suffer. Is it possible that we have learned this only to-day? Wounds, mutilations, cold, diseases, every sort of heart-rending accident, and, chief of all, the pains of birth, without which no one of us made his appearance in this world—surely all these are indispensable conditions of existence.

Surely this is the very thing the alleviation of which, the assistance of which, forms the substance of the rational life of men—the very thing upon which the true activity of life is directed.

An understanding of the sufferings of personality and of men’s errors, and activity directed toward their diminution, constitutes the whole business of human life. That is just why I am a man,—an individual,—in order that I may understand the sufferings of other individuals, and that is why I am a rational consciousness, in order that in the sufferings of every other separate individual I may see the general cause of suffering—error—and may eradicate it in myself and in others. How can the material of his work be a cause of suffering to the workman? It is the same as though a plowman were to say that unplowed soil was his suffering.

Unplowed land can be a source of suffering only for him who would like to see the field plowed, but who does not consider it the business of his life to plow it.

Activity directed to the immediate loving service of the suffering and to the diminution of the general cause of suffering—error—is the only joyful labor which lies before a man, and gives him that inalienable happiness in which his life consists.

There is, for a man, but one suffering, and it is that

suffering which makes a man, voluntarily or otherwise, give himself up to that life in which there is for him the only happiness.

This suffering is the consciousness of the contradiction between my own sinfulness and all the world, and not only the possibility, but the obligation, of realizing, not by some one or other, but in my own person, the whole truth in my own life and in that of all the world.

It is impossible to alleviate this suffering, either by sharing the sins of the world, or by perceiving one's own sin, or yet by ceasing to believe not only in the possibility, but also in the duty of any one else, but in my own, to realize all truth in my life and in the life of the world. The first only augments my sufferings, the second deprives me of the force of life. Only the consciousness and activity of true life alleviate this suffering, by annihilating the disproportion between individual life and its aim, as acknowledged by man.

Voluntarily or otherwise, man must acknowledge that his life does not hedge in his person from birth to death, and that the object recognized by him is an object that can be attained, and that, in his striving toward it, in the acknowledgment of his greater and greater sinfulness, and in the greater and greater realization of all the truth in his life, and in the life of the world, consists, has consisted, and always will consist, the business of his life, which is inseparable from the life of the whole world.

If rational consciousness does not drive a man, voluntarily or involuntarily, to the only true path of life on which there are no obstacles, no evil, but only an indestructible, ever growing, never beginning, never ending happiness, then the suffering which flows from error as to the sense of his life will so drive him.

CONCLUSION

THE life of man is a striving after happiness, and what he strives for — that is given to him.

Evil in the form of death and suffering is visible to man only when he takes the law of his corporeal, animal existence from the law of his life. Only when he, being a man, descends to the level of the animal, does he see death and suffering. Death and suffering breathe sighs upon him from all quarters, like bugbears, and drive him upon the one path of human life which is open to him, subservient to his law of reason, and expressing itself in love. Death and suffering are only crimes committed by man against his law of life. For a man who lives according to his law, there is no death and no suffering.

“Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

“Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me; for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls.

“For My yoke is easy, and My burden is light.” (Matt. xi.)

The life of man is a striving toward good; what he strives for — that is given to him; since life cannot be death, and good cannot be evil.

APPENDIX I

PEOPLE generally say: “We study life, not from the consciousness of our own life, in general, but outside of ourselves.” But this is the same as saying: “We look at an object, not with our eyes, in general, but outside of ourselves.”

We behold the objects outside of ourselves because we see them in our eyes, and we know life outside of ourselves only because we know it in ourselves. And we see objects only as we see them in our eyes, and we define life outside of ourselves only as we know it in

ourselves. But we know life in ourselves as a striving after happiness. And therefore, without a definition of life as a striving after happiness, it is impossible, not only to observe, but even to see, life.

The first and principal act of our consciousness as living beings consists in our including many different objects in our conception of one living being, and this living being we exclude from every other.

We learn that a man on horseback is not a number of beings, and is not one being, not because we observe all the parts constituting the man and the horse, but because neither in the head, nor in the legs, nor in the other parts of the man and the horse do we see that separate striving after happiness which we know in ourselves. And we know that the man and the horse are not one being, but two beings, because we know in them two separate aspirations toward good, while in ourselves we know only one.

Only from this do we know that there is life in the combination of horse and rider, because there is life in a drove of horses, that there is life in birds, in insects, in trees, in the grass. But if we did not know that the horse and the man each desired his own happiness, that each horse in the drove desired this separately, that such happiness is desired by every bird, beetle, insect, tree, and blade of grass, we should not perceive separateness in the being, and, not perceiving separateness, we could never have understood any living being; and a regiment of cavalry, and a flock, and birds, and insects, and plants, — all would be like the waves in the sea, and all the world would melt together for us into one indistinguishable movement, in which we could not by any possibility find the secret of life.

If I know that the horse and the dog and the tick that lives upon him are living beings, and if I can observe them, it is only because the horse and the dog and the tick have each their separate aims, — the aim of each being his own happiness. I know this because I know myself as an individual striving after the same happiness.

In this striving after happiness also lies the foundation of every knowledge of life. Without a confession that this striving after good, which man feels within himself, is life, and an image of all life, no study of life is possible, and no observation of life is practicable. And hence, observation begins when life is already known, and no observation upon the manifestations of life can (as it appears to scientific man) define life itself.

Men do not recognize the definitions of life in the striving toward happiness which they find in their consciousness, but they recognize the possibility of the knowledge of this striving in the tick, and on the foundation of that supposititious knowledge, founded upon nothing at all, of this happiness toward which the tick is striving, they make observations and draw deductions even as to the very existence of life.

My every conception as to external life is founded upon the knowledge of my striving toward happiness. And therefore, only through having recognized in what my happiness and my life consist, I shall be in a condition to recognize in what consist the happiness and life of other beings. But the happiness and life of other beings I cannot in any way know without having recognized my own.

Observations upon other beings, striving toward their aims which are unknown to me, constituting semblances of that happiness the striving after which I know in myself, not only can explain nothing to me, but can certainly hide from me my true knowledge of life.

For, to study life in other beings, without having a definition of one's own life is the same as describing a surrounding district without having got its center. Only after having fixed upon an immovable point as a center can the region be described. But, whatever figures we may draw, without a center there will be no surrounding district.

APPENDIX II

FALSE science, studying the manifestations which accompany life, and assuming to study life itself, by this assumption distorts the idea of life: and hence, the longer it studies the manifestations of that which it calls life, the further it gets from the idea of life, which it wishes to study.

At first mammals are studied, then the other creatures, vertebrates, fishes, plants, corals, cells, microscopic organisms, and the matter is carried to such a point that the distinction between living and non-living, between the bounds of organic and of non-organic, between the bounds of one organism and another, are lost.

It is carried to such a point that what cannot be observed seems to be the most important subject of investigation and observation. The secret of life and the explanation of everything seems to lie in comma-shaped and other bacilli, which are not visible, but which are rather assumed, which are discovered to-day and forgotten to-morrow. The explanation of everything is assumed in those beings which are contained in microscopic beings, and in those which are also contained even in these, and so forth, to infinity, as though infinite activity of the little is not the same as infinite activity of the great.

The mystery will be revealed when all the infinity of the little shall have been investigated to the end, that is to say, never. And men do not see this — the idea that the question will attain solution in the infinitely small is an indubitable proof that the question is wrongly stated. And this, the last stage of folly, — that which clearly demonstrates the utter loss of sense in the investigation, — this stage is regarded as a triumph of science; the last degree of blindness appears the highest degree of vision. Men have come to their wits' end, and have thereby clearly proved to themselves the falsity of that path along which they have been journeying; and there are no limits to their rapture. If we can only increase

the power of the microscope a little more, we shall understand the conversion of the inorganic into the organic, and of the organic into the psychic, and the whole mystery of life will be laid open to us.

Men who study shadows instead of objects have entirely forgotten the object which they were studying, and, plunging deeper and deeper into the shadows, they have reached utter darkness, and rejoice because the shadow is dense.

The meaning of life is revealed in the consciousness of man as a striving after happiness. The elucidation of this happiness, the more complete definition of it, constitutes the chief aim and work of the life of all mankind, and because this labor is difficult, that is to say, not a plaything, but toil, men come to the conclusion that the definition of this happiness cannot be found in that place where it is situated, that is to say, in the rational consciousness of man, and that, therefore, it is necessary to seek it everywhere,—except where it is indicated.

This is something of the sort that a man would do who had been given an accurate list of all that he required, and who, not knowing how to read it, should fling aside the list, and inquire of every one whom he met whether they did not know what he needed; for men seek everywhere, except in the consciousness of man itself, for the definition of life, which is inscribed in the soul of man in ineffaceable letters, in his aspiration for happiness. This is all the more strange because all mankind, in the persons of its wisest representatives, beginning with the Greek saying which runs, "Know thyself," has announced it, and continues to announce it, in precisely the opposite sense. All religious teachings are nothing else than definitions of life, than strivings toward that active happiness which is accessible to man, and which cannot lead astray.

APPENDIX. III

EVER more and more clearly does the voice of reason become audible to man ; ever more and more frequently does man lend an ear to this voice ; and the time will come, and has already come, when this voice has grown stronger than the voice summoning to personal happiness and to delusive duty.

On the one hand, it becomes ever clearer that the life of personality, with its enticements, cannot be happiness ; on the other hand, that the payment of every debt prescribed by men is only a deceit, which deprives man of the possibility of settling the sole debt of man, — to that rational and honorable origin from which he proceeds. That old delusion which demands a belief in that which has no rational explanation has already been worn out, and it is impossible to return to it.

Formerly, men said : “ Do not think, but believe in the duty which we prescribe. Reason will deceive you ; faith alone will disclose to you the true happiness of life.” And man tried to believe, and did believe ; but his relations to men proved to him that other men believe in something entirely different, and assert that this other something gives greater happiness to man. The decision of the question has become inevitable, as to which faith — out of many — is the more true ; but reason alone can decide this.

Man always learns all things through his reason, and not through faith. It might be possible to deceive by affirming that he learns all things through faith, and not through reason ; but as soon as man knows two faiths, and sees men confessing another faith, just as he does his own, he is placed under the inevitable necessity of deciding the matter by his reason. A Buddhist, on becoming acquainted with Mahometanism, if he remains a Buddhist, will remain a Buddhist by faith no longer, but by reason. As soon as another faith has been presented to him, and the question as to whether he is to reject his own faith, or the one offered him, — that question

is inevitably settled by the reason. And if, on becoming acquainted with Mahometanism, he has remained a Buddhist, his former blind faith in Buddha is now infallibly founded on a basis of reason.

Attempts in our day to instil spiritual matters into man by faith, while ignoring his reason, are precisely the same as attempts to feed a man and ignore his mouth.

Men's intercourse with each other has proved to them that they all have a common foundation of knowledge, and men can never more return to their former errors; and the time is coming, and is even now come, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and, hearing, shall be made alive.

It is impossible to drown that voice, because that voice is not the single voice of any one person, but the voice of all the rational consciousness of mankind, which is expressed in every separate man, and in the best men of mankind, and now already in the majority of men.

THE END





